

THE
SUBJECT OF TRACT XC.
EXAMINED,
IN CONNECTION WITH THE
HISTORY OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES,
AND THE
STATEMENTS OF CERTAIN ENGLISH DIVINES.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
THE CASE OF BISHOP MOUNTAGUE,
IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES I.

BY THE
REV. FREDERICK OAKELEY, M.A.
FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD,
PREBENDARY OF LICHFIELD,
AND MINISTER OF MARGARET CHAPEL, ST. MARY-LE-BONE.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE original design, in this publication, was to make the Testimonies of the Divines its principal, and the remaining observations merely its subordinate feature. But the introductory remarks have grown, in the progress of the attempt, to a length, and some of the facts on which they are founded, appear to the writer to assume an importance, on which he did not originally reckon. He has accordingly altered the wording of the title page, while the sheets were passing through the press. This information is given to account for the prominence assigned to the Testimonies in the opening of the Inquiry; an inconvenience which could not have been obviated without the reconstruction of the whole.

THE
SUBJECT OF TRACT XC.

&c.

AMONG other objections which have been made to No. 90. of the Tracts for the Times, it is said to propound a view of the Thirty-nine Articles, which is unprecedented in the Church of England. The present collection of extracts is brought forward for the purpose of showing that such is not the case. One of two conclusions seems plain from them; either, that the divines from whose writings they are taken, had been at pains to reconcile certain opinions, which they both held and taught, with the terms of the Articles; or, at least, that they did not consider subscription to those Articles to present a bar to the promulgation of those opinions. And, since no view of subscription, however lax, goes the length of justifying persons in *teaching*, as well as *holding*, doctrines, which the Articles preclude, we are left to the inference, that, unless these divines regarded the Articles as a mere dead letter, they must

have been of opinion, that such doctrines were not precluded by them.

Nothing is as yet said of the case of Bishop Mountague, (appended to the extracts,) which amounts to far more than this ; amounts, in fact, to something very like an *authoritative decision*, on the part of the then Church of England, *in favour* of the consistency of certain very close approximations to Roman doctrine, with the language of her formularies ; such decision having been pronounced, after a careful deliberation, by a committee of Bishops, appointed by the king to represent the national Church.

For the present, however, I waive the case of Bishop Mountague, and confine myself to the extracts. And, in the first place, it is necessary to state, how much, and how much only, these citations are intended to prove. This necessity results from a prevailing tendency to mistake the nature of the proof to which what are called “Catenæ,” and all testimonies of that description, are directed. Persons have sometimes appeared to think, that they could overthrow the evidence of “Catenæ” from the works of our divines, by producing counter “Catenæ” from the same sources ; which would indeed be the case, were such evidence adduced to prove that the doctrines, which it accredits, are *true* ; or, again, have been uniformly taught in our Church. But all that “Catenæ” *necessarily* show, and all that, as a matter of fact, they are generally intended to show, is, that certain doctrines are not *new*. This is said in anticipation of an

objection which may possibly be made to the proof now attempted. It may be called a "one-sided" view of the question. Persons may speak of the possibility of overwhelming such quotations as those now exhibited, with quotations, also from the works of English divines, of a directly opposite tenour.

Now such possibility is not merely admitted, but asserted. To what, however, does it amount? Plainly to no more than this; that the later Church of England (whether happily or not,) has ruled, or at least acquiesced in the presumption, that her Articles permit a very great latitude on both sides. It has never been maintained, that I know of, on the side of the Tract, assuredly not by its author himself, that all the doctrines, in behalf of which he pleads at least the *negative* testimony of the Thirty-nine Articles, are *imperative* upon the Clergy of the Established Church, *as such*; but simply that they are *compatible with honest subscription*. Now, this is distinctly denied on the other side. The doctrines in question, (at least in the extent intimated in the Tract,) are not merely, *in the judgment of the objectors*, excluded by the terms of the Articles, but have, it is farther urged, always been *considered, in the later English Church, to be so excluded by them*. This, then, and this only, is the point in question.

Again, it is not to the purpose to urge, as is sometimes done in objection to evidence like that now produced, that English divines are often inconsistent, not only with one another, but *with themselves*;

and thus that little, after all, is to be gathered from their statements on any one side. For the object, in these cases, is not to *justify the divines*, any more than to *ground* particular doctrines upon their *authority*, but merely to show what they have felt themselves at liberty to say, and been actually able to say without protest. And this fact has its own weight, whatever these divines may chance to have said elsewhere. Of course I do not here speak of reserves and qualifications made in the neighbourhood of the several passages.

Now it is by no means admitted of the present quotations, that they serve merely as *precedents*. Considering that they involve the judgment, upon certain subjects, of men like Andrewes and Thorndike, (not to speak of others) men not merely of profound learning, but of eminent piety, and known moderation, they must, with many persons, carry weight far beyond the very subordinate use now made of them. But there is no occasion to press them into our service beyond the point for which they are here claimed. It is enough that the authors of those passages are divines and bishops of our Church. And this being so, the question then is, not so much, who these divines and bishops were, as, what they maintained.

But there is yet another conceivable objection to the present line of defence, against which it is well to provide. It may be said, that, besides being unfair to our Church to represent her as a witness to doctrines so very much above the average pitch of

her theology, and so entirely at variance with her *occasional* teaching, it is also highly inexpedient, and especially at a time when many of her members are known to be tending in the direction of Rome, to select exclusively, and exhibit synoptically, the avowedly strongest statements which her annals any where supply, in favour of doctrines commonly thought to be characteristic of the Churches in the Roman obedience.

But this objection must be at once met by saying, that persons are driven upon this course in spite of themselves. It has been one result of the turn which the present controversy has taken, as observed by Mr. Ward, in a passage of his pamphlet quoted by Dr. Pusey ¹, (a result, no doubt ordered for the best, however, with many, a subject of regret,) to provoke developments, or put upon modes of defence, which would otherwise have been premature, at least, if not positively objectionable. Mr. Newman speaks of having been deterred from certain explanations, in the first instance, by the fear of tempting persons "to go as far" as they legitimately might. And such, no doubt, is the tendency of the present argument, though framed with a view to quite a different object. All that can be said is, that, as things are, persons are exposed to a choice of difficulties. And, as we

¹ "Through the course which Mr. Newman has been obliged to take, the *Ora pro nobis* has been brought before persons who would otherwise have never thought of it."—A Few More Words, &c. page 84.

all know, the apprehension of possible results, though, (in the estimate of many) disastrous, must not deter us from a course manifestly right in itself. And such seems to be this course of obviating, if so be, great misapprehensions which are moving well-intentioned persons to adopt measures, and to use words, from which perhaps they would shrink, if they knew all, or bethought themselves, at the moment, of all they know. And in the responsibility of such (hypothetically) rash measures, and random words, any one would certainly in a degree be involved, who should, on whatever grounds of mere expediency, omit, where he feels himself able, to throw light on the subject. This, then, is one very plain Christian reason for the present publication; more shall presently be added. And, on the other hand, in stating, as has here been done, to how very little, after all, the present argument pretends, (the question being simply, whether that little be *enough* for the immediate purpose) it is hoped that all is done, which is possible under the circumstances, towards hindering persons from taking any undue advantage of it.

One inducement, then, to the present undertaking, is the earnest desire of promoting peace and unity, by throwing out for the consideration of persons, of whom the writer of these remarks is bound to speak with respect, and into whose difficulties he trusts he is not unable to enter, a view which may not have occurred to them, but which seems to make it at least

doubtful whether, by the course they feel it their duty to take, they be not fomenting needless divisions, and encouraging a spirit which, in its fullest developments (out of any man's power to arrest) they would be among the first to deprecate. Is it not that they are seeking to oppose, as at variance with the doctrine of the Church of which they are members, views, concerning which it is, at all events, a doubtful question, *whether they have not in past ages been assumed, or even pronounced, compatible with that doctrine* ; and those, too, the very ages to which many of these persons are accustomed to appeal against the tone of teaching prevalent in our Church both at an earlier, and a later, period? and would it not seem that, in thwarting the present movement in favour of "more catholic views than satisfied the last century," they are rather siding with the Puritans of former times, than with the moderate party in the Church of England which they wish to represent? The case of Bishop Mountague is pertinent to this point. If the value of the evidence about to be produced be not greatly overrated, it would certainly tend to the conclusion, that, not they are introducing "a new era" in the Church of England, who endeavour to reconcile certain doctrines, however now, as of old, unpopular, with the language of the Articles, but rather they, who speak of subjecting to penalties, or placing under incapacities, the persons who are but claiming liberty to *hold* what English divines of former times claimed, and

were allowed, liberty to *teach*. This, rather than the other, would seem, if it may be said with all respect, to be the line of "innovation." No one questions the absolute right of the Church of this, as of any other day (properly represented), to impose new Articles, or a new sense upon her present; nor, again, the right and, what is more, the obligation, of individuals, whether in the University or elsewhere, to act for themselves, either in the matter of Testimonials, or in whatever other way, according to their conscientious notion of the words "doctrine and discipline of the Church of England." Only, inasmuch as the imposition of restrictions upon liberty of conscience, if it be not a duty, is certainly a sin, in that, (to omit other considerations) it is an injustice to individuals to set a mark upon them without reason, and an injustice to the Church, of which we are members, to deprive her of the services of Ministers who, not being (upon the hypothesis) disqualified for their functions, may, on other grounds, become instruments for the promotion of God's glory, and the edification of their brethren; it should certainly be a grave question with any one, who may feel inclined to debar, as far as he is able, certain persons from ecclesiastical or quasi-ecclesiastical privileges, whether he may not be laying up for himself materials of future repentance, while believing himself, in his heart, to be "doing God service".

² To avoid all possibility of misapprehension, I will say that I am not here disputing the prerogative of Heads of Colleges to

But it is not merely that we are bound in duty to the Church of Christ to do what we can towards healing her "unhappy divisions," and to individuals, (not to deprecate, on our own account, the exercise of a power which may affect ourselves, for this is a mere trifle, or rather such temporary hardship as may be the result of it, is likely to be a benefit to ourselves, but) out of very tenderness towards our brethren, to press on them the duty, as well as the immense importance at this critical juncture, of calm religious reflection. We are likewise under especial obligation to our Bishops, to aid them (as, in a measure, the humblest has the power) in the course of moderation and forbearance which they have hitherto maintained, amid many temptations to deviate from it, under the excitement of this anxious controversy. It becomes us, where we think we have the means, to strengthen, if it may be said, their hands, by putting before a party which is endeavouring, by clamour, to provoke them to some authoritative interference, the adequate vindication (may it not rather be said the true grounds?) of their past and continued forbearance. For, who can doubt, that

order all matters connected with *education* in their respective Societies, according to their own view of the interests of those entrusted to their care. I refer only to cases in which the "doctrine of the Church of England" is directly in question. And both the general tone of conversation in Oxford, and the tenor of recent publications, are enough to protect me, in what has now been said, from the charge of harbouring merely ideal apprehensions.

the pointed avoidance of all allusion to *doctrine*, in the only instance in which any of our Prelates has hitherto felt it necessary to interpose publicly, in consequence of the Tract, as well as the great reluctance manifested by the Bishops generally to interpose at all, have arisen from a disinclination, on their parts, even to appear to *rule*, (at least without very great caution,) that a certain construction of a Formulary, so avowedly comprehensive as the Thirty-nine Articles, is *absolutely inconsistent* with the obligations imposed by subscription; and thus to run risk of a schism in our Church, the effects of which it is impossible to calculate?

Again, it is a plain duty of justice and charity towards individuals, lying under grievous imputations on the score of unscrupulousness, if not positive dishonesty, to show what can be shown in their defence; and this, quite irrespectively of any claims which they may have upon this or that person on more private grounds; though, of course, the tie of affection, or the sense of obligation for services felt to be inestimable, will increase, in particular cases, the desire of coming forward, at all hazards, and with how little soever hope of success, in their behalf. In a public document, the production of grave and experienced persons, holding high and responsible situations in the country, and almost proverbial for caution, the view of the Tract has been pronounced, not merely dangerous (which is a mere expression of opinion upon *it*), but “evasive,” which involves also a

very serious reflection upon its author. Under these circumstances, it seems but common justice to the writer of the Tract, to show, if it can be shown, that he has done no more than others have done, without reproach, before him; or rather that, with great candour, and at the risk of much odium, he has gone out of his way to adjust with the terms of the Articles, statements which our older divines seem rather to have *advanced without scruple*; thus challenging investigations which they felt themselves strong enough to defy, and providing against objections, which they would not even imagine. Many, probably, who cannot bring themselves to think the author of the Tract *right*, would be equally, or even more, unwilling, to think some of our older divines *wrong*, which, in such measure as his statements are borne out by their authority, is the virtual effect of condemning him. And, after all, even if this farther consequence be not feared, or lamented, still, (as has been already said,) the plea of precedent would be thus made good on the side of the Tract.

In the way of introduction to the following extracts, I will observe, that the result of recent enquiries into our ecclesiastical annals of the three last centuries, has been to convince me, that the later Church of England has been, from first to last, remarkably unwilling to protest, *as a Church*, against the doctrines of Rome. Her authoritative protests, when she has thought it right to make

them, have been directed, almost, if not quite, without exception, against a far different school of theology. This remark appears to me to apply even to the period of the Reformation itself; when, if at any time, the Church of England might have been expected to declare herself strongly and unambiguously on the Protestant side. And, of course, there are very many who consider that she has so declared herself in the Thirty-nine Articles. But if this fact be not certain from the language of the Articles themselves, (and that it is not certain seems to be admitted at least by those who resort to the private opinions of the Reformers to determine the question,) certain it is, that history gives *no countenance whatever* to the opinion that, the Articles were drawn up *with the view of excluding Catholics*.

With respect to the original Articles of 1552, it seems doubtful, whether they were ever enforced; if at all, it was but in few instances³. After the revision of 1562, they *were* enforced; but, as it appears, against *Non-Conformists*, and not Roman Catholics. The question with Rome was then, as in after times, regarded in a merely political point of view.

“*Against Papists* (says Fuller, who certainly cannot be suspected of any ‘Romanistic’ bias,) it was exacted that, to write, print, &c. *that the Queen was a*

³ “He (Cranmer) laboured to have the clergy subscribe them; but against their will he compelled none.” Strype’s Cranmer, p. 272. Cf. Bp. Short’s Hist. of the Church of England, § 484.

heretic, &c., should be adjudged *treason*. *Against Non-Conformists*, it was provided that every Priest or Minister should, before the Nativity of Christ next following, declare his assent, and subscribe, to all the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Convocation of 1562, under pain of deprivation ⁴."

And accordingly it appears, that Roman Catholics continued in the communion, and even in the Ministry, of the Church of England, for several years after the first promulgation of the Articles.

"Hitherto" (*i. e.* till A.D. 1570), "Papists generally without regret repaired to the places of divine service, and were present at our prayers, sermons, and *Sacraments* In which sense, one may say, that *the whole land was of one language and one speech*. Hitherto the English Papists *slept in a whole skin, and so might have continued*, had they not wilfully torn it themselves ⁵."

It farther appears, that many members of the Lower House of Convocation, who were Roman Catholics, subscribed the Articles upon the revision in 1562 ⁶.

⁴ Fuller, p. 98. Eliz.

⁵ Fuller, p. 98. Eliz. See also Strype's Grindal, p. 98. "Of the subscribers (to Queen Eliz. injunctions for conformity), there were many, who had said Mass in Queen Mary's time, and such as would not change their custom of old Pater Noster." Vide Short's Hist. of the Church of England, § 437.

⁶ Strype, (Ann. of Ref. c. xxviii.) gives their names; and, among them, we find that of the celebrated John Bridgwater, (called in Latin, Aquapontanus) who, in 1582, published the Treatise called

The term "Recusant," by which the Roman Catholics of this country were formerly designated, at once denotes the ground, and fixes the date, of their separation from the national Church. It was not *upon the promulgation of the Articles*, nor upon any other measure of the Church of England, but upon the *political regulations* which arose out of the formal excommunication of Elizabeth, in 1569, that Roman Catholics withdrew from the communion of our Church. Before that time, not even the Oath of Supremacy was a bar, as a general rule, to their admission even to *civil*, far less to ecclesiastical, privileges; the majority of them understanding this oath as a mere test of loyalty⁷.

But as to the Articles, never, that I can find, were they urged, or felt, as a ground of disunion between the Churches; and this fact, as I must consider it, is

"*Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Angliâ adversus Calvinopapistas et Puritanos*," being an account of the sufferings of English Roman Catholics in the time of Elizabeth.

⁷ See a Tract called the "Execution of Justice in England," (1583.) "These *seditionous acts* . . . have made them traitors . . . *not their books*, nor their words, no, nor their cakes of wax which they call *Agnus Dei*," &c. (p. 45.)

Again, the Jesuits, addressing Queen Elizabeth, said, "In the beginning of thy kingdom thou didst deal something more gently with Catholics: none were then urged by thee, or pressed either to thy sect, or to the denial of their faith." Again, "none were ever vexed *that way, simply for that he was either Priest or Catholic*, but because they were suspected (of disloyalty)."—Important Considerations written by the Secular Priests against the Jesuits, 1601.

farther attested by the statement so commonly made, that Rome *withdrew herself*, and not *was driven*, from our communion ; and again by the plea, upon which the penal enactments, carried out from time to time in this country against Roman Catholics, have always been defended ; viz. that they were enforced upon merely civil, and in no wise upon religious, grounds. And if the “unscrupulousness of Roman Catholics” in respect of oaths, and other similar obligations, be urged as the ground of the insufficiency of our formularies as means of excluding them, then it must be shown, *why they were eventually excluded*. For that they did refuse *some* tests, is undeniable.

But to return to the Articles. There would seem to have been reasons, both of necessity and of policy, which would be likely to influence the English Reformers in favour of a very great latitude of expression upon subjects which other Protestants, or they, under other circumstances, might have been apt to determine with far greater precision.

It is much to be considered, in the first place, that, with the English Reformers, Protestantism was, as I may say, an *after-thought*. The English Reformation, upon whatever theological grounds it may eventually have been based, was, undoubtedly, in the first instance, a mere political movement ; being (so far) unfavourably distinguished from the continental struggle, which, though it ultimately issued in excesses from which we have been providentially kept, was, in its origin, far more than the English

Reformation, of the nature of an *indignant protest against existing corruptions* ⁹. I do not at all deny that corruptions of a like crying enormity, though perhaps of a different kind, existed in this country also. All I say is, that, not the scandal of these corruptions, but the influence of the Pope, and especially as it pressed inconveniently upon Henry, was the *gravamen*, to which, in this country, the quarrel with Rome owes its origin. This, of course, is not stated as a discovery, but merely adduced as an evidence to the point in hand. But the question with the See of Rome being thus opened, (no otherwise upon ecclesiastical, than as they were subservient to political, grounds,) it rapidly assumed a theological shape; and the English divines of the time were forced upon the necessity of treating, and, what is far harder, of legislating, on various and abstruse points of doctrine, under all the disadvantages of persons who had been educated in the system they were now obliged to oppose, and been rather led by circumstances, than moved by any spontaneous impulse, to adopt that, into which they were suddenly required to throw themselves.

Now this consideration, I cannot but think, will account, in a great measure, for the inconsistencies which are to be found in the writings of the English

⁹ This unfavourable feature of our Reformation was observed by the foreigners; ⁷Ἦλθε δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ξένος τις, πεμφθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Βρετανίας, μόνον διαλεγόμενος περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου γάμου τοῦ βασιλέως· τῶν δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων, οὐ μέλει, ὥς

Reformers, as well as for the (presumed) indecisive character of the Formulary which we owe to them. How was it possible, that men, of whatever ability, who had no thoughts, but for external and accidental occurrences, of originating formal declarations on the subject of Catholic doctrine, should come to the task with that maturity of reflection, and extent of foresight, which are absolutely necessary, (except where the want of long previous preparation is supplied in some degree by strong single-hearted earnestness,) to the statement of precise and definite views of theology? The divines of our own country took up Protestantism in details and by degrees, not like Luther and Calvin, as a comprehensive system¹. We find, accordingly, that, when pressed to declare themselves formally upon the great doctrinal questions which agitated Europe at the time, they “beat about,” if I may use the expression, for assistance in more experienced quarters². Now, the idea thus thrown out, if it do

φησι, τῷ βασιλεῖ.—Melancthon, quoted in Cardwell’s Preface to the Two Books of Edward VI.

The Greek Church, of the present day, is said to sympathize more with the Foreign Protestant communities, than with the Church of England, from esteeming the Foreign a more *conscientious* act than the English Reformation.

¹ Hence the doctrinal incongruities discoverable in the works, for instance, of Cranmer, who was chiefly concerned in drawing up the Articles.

² “The communication with those eminent men” (the foreign Reformers) “which had been opened, in the first instance, at the desire, and for the private purposes, of Henry, and had been dis-

not seem improbable, would precisely explain their adoption in the Formulary which they actually put out, of *terms rather than definitions*, and *vague definitions rather than those more precise*; and, again, for their practice (observed by Mr. Newman) of combating *popular views*, rather than *authoritative statements*, of doctrine, and protesting against *apparent practices*, rather than embarrassing themselves with minute theological distinctions. This is just the course of persons who do not feel themselves "at home" in a subject, as I suppose it is no injustice to the English Reformers to say that they could not have

continued, from a mutual feeling of distrust, during the latter portion of his reign, was resumed, at the death of that prince, and carried to the greatest possible extent. Hooper, Horne, Cox, Traheron, and others, who became conspicuous in the history of the English Church, were frequent correspondents, and some of them intimate friends, of Bullinger and the Reformers of Zurich. Bucer wrote a gratulatory letter to the Church of England in praise of its homilies, and with the view of recommending farther alterations; Calvin dedicated a part of his Commentary to the Protector Somerset, and urged him to carry on the *great work in which he was engaged*; Cranmer repeated his earnest invitations to Melancthon, Hardenburg, and other distinguished Reformers, and John à Lasco, &c. &c. were received in England in the most favourable manner, and many of them placed in situations of trust and influence." Dr. Cardwell's Preface to Two Prayer Books of Edward VI. p. ix.

Dr. Short shows (Hist. of Ch. of Eng. § 483) how much assistance the English reformers derived in the Articles from foreign sources; and he vindicates them (§ 343) on the ground of the difficulty of their task.

been, in the great controversies of their time. They neither came to their work, like the divines of Trent, as persons who had been long familiar with the system they were required to develope and secure ; nor, again, like the framers of the German or Swiss Confessions, with that almost intuitive perception of their subject, which is well known to be the result of deep interest in any matter, and which is no inadequate substitute for long study and laborious research. The contrast, in point of precision, between the earlier and later among the Thirty-nine Articles, which Mr. Ward has observed in the "Appendix" to his Pamphlet, is a confirmation of the view now suggested.

But another consideration, quite sufficient to explain the very remarkable difference, in respect of *stringency*, between the Thirty-nine Articles and Continental Formularies, on whichever side, is that of the peculiar circumstances, under which the Articles were constructed. The divines of Trent, or, again, of Switzerland, drew up their several Confessions of Faith with the freedom and fearlessness of persons who knew that the Churches and countries which they represented, were "with them³." The

³ Compare, for instance, sweeping statements, like the following in the Helvetic Confession, with the declarations of the Thirty-nine Articles :—"Cæteras (præter Eucharistiam) cæremoniarum ambages inutiles ac innumerabiles, vasa, vestes, vela, faces, aras, aurum, argentum, quatenus pervertendæ religioni serviunt, idola præsertim . . . ac id genus omnia profana, a sacro nostro cœtu procul arcemus."

Again :

English Reformers, on the contrary, were hampered in their work by the most conflicting and embarrassing influences. They were kept, willing or unwilling, in the orbit of neutrality by the effect of opposite forces. On the one hand, there were the foreign Protestants, clamouring for a sanction, on the part of the "first of Reformed Churches," of their extreme proceedings ⁴. On the other, there were the known sentiments of the English nation, any thing but ripe for a radical change of religion, if not the prospect of difficulties in Convocation, many members of which were in favour of the old system ; and the consequent necessity of not making the Articles unacceptable to those to whom they were to be submitted ⁵.

Again : "Proinde cœlibatum, ritum monasticum, et totum hoc ignavum vitæ genus, superstitiosorum hominum abominabile commentum, procul rejicimus, æquè et Ecclesiæ, et reipublicæ, repugnans."

⁴ The English Reformers applied for help to Melancthon, as the most moderate of the continental Protestants, and so the fittest to aid them in their difficult work. But, for this very reason, the ultra party abroad kept him back ; "quod *mollitiem* animi ejus suspectam haberent." See Dr. Cardwell's Preface to the Two Books of Edward VI. p. v.

⁵ Strange indeed is it, that history should make it doubtful whether the Forty-two Articles were ever submitted to Convocation *at all*, considering the title which they originally bore. If they were not, their profession misrepresents them in a way which involves something more than disingenuousness in the parties concerned in promulgating them. Yet the respected author of the History of the Church of England thus writes, and substantiates his observation by reference to documents of the time. "From the

Mr. Ward⁶ appears to have stated this point somewhat drily and technically, when he imputes (as I understand him,) to the English Reformers, a deliberate and disingenuous purpose, *throughout their task*, (for in places they can hardly be screened from the imputation,) of adjusting the claims of these rival

title under which the Articles were originally published *, it might be supposed that they derived their authority from the sanction of Convocation; but if they were ever submitted to the Upper House, which is very questionable, it is *indubitable* that they were never brought before the Lower; while *all the original mandates which remain, prove that they were promulgated by Royal authority alone.*" Short's History of the Church of England, § 48.

Heylin (Hist. of the Reformation, p. 126, A. D. 1552,) considers this supposition too monstrous to be entertained, and accordingly supposes that Convocation delegated its power to a Committee, (nominated, according to Dr. Short, by *the king.*) He argues, rather strangely, that the profession of the title is justified by his view, as though a Committee of one House of Convocation were equivalent to the whole body of the two. The whole story, like all else connected with the annals of the English Reformation, is, to say the least, very uncomfortable.

But whether or not Cranmer drew up the Articles for the Convocation, (if so, the proof to the present point is so much the stronger; and even the fact, if true, that he did not ultimately submit them, does not show that he had no intention of submitting them to one or both Houses,) still it is certain that he both designed, and attempted, to obtain the subscription of the Clergy (Strype's Cranmer, p. 27) which would alone oblige the course of moderation.

⁶ A Few More Words, &c. p. 43.

* Articuli de quibus in *Synodo Londinensi*, &c.

parties, the foreign Protestants on the one side, and the old English Catholics on the other. Mr. Ward seems to think, that they set out, and acted all along, with the intention of reconciling, as a kind of mathematical problem, the maximum of Protestantism with the minimum of offence. It is not, perhaps, necessary to go this length; and if it be not necessary, one is bound, in charity, to stop short of it. That the English Reformers were anxious to give many of the Articles as Protestant an air, as they thought it prudent to risk, this I cannot but apprehend. And yet it may be questioned whether, *on the whole*, they acted with any direct and systematic disingenuousness; and not rather in some such way as the framer of a petition to Parliament (for instance) who wishes to make a striking manifesto of opinion, without losing more signatures than he can help; or, again, as a somewhat too compromising preacher, who, under the influence of anticipated objections, puts saving, (which are, in fact, neutralizing,) clauses into his sermon. Of course such proceedings are quite inconsistent with strong, earnest, and distinctly realized, views; but these it is, I will say, quite certain, that Archbishop Cranmer, for one, did not possess either way; at least when he drew up the Articles. That he did not possess them, is sufficiently shown by the fact of his writings being cited on completely different sides of a theological controversy.

It may seem unfair to the Reformers to represent

their course in respect of the Articles under any other character than that of a wise and commendable moderation. But it is to be considered, whether many of the points which they have left indeterminate, be not points, if not of necessary faith, at least of necessary deduction from the ground-work of all faith, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, upon which we thankfully acknowledge that the Articles *are* unambiguous. I may mention the subject of the "Holy Catholic Church," as one among many others, upon which a precise Formulary would not merely *allow* of the orthodox, but *preclude* the erroneous, view. There are points of Catholic belief, only not condemned in the Articles (such *e. g.* as the Eucharistic Sacrifice,) the *denial* of which, if it appear strong to call it actual heresy, is, at least, of a directly heretical tendency; and want of explicitness on these, if intentional, implies unworthy compromise; if unintentional, culpable short-sightedness. It must not be complimented with the name of moderation. It is moderation only when its subject matter is unessential; but the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism are so fundamental and irreconcilable, that, if the Articles (as I have all along supposed,) give free scope for near approximations to the extremes *on both sides*, they *must* involve the compatibility with honest subscription, of what, in the judgment of one, or the other party, is serious error. This consequence of the present argument may as well be frankly acknowledged at once, since it cannot

be avoided. But then it must be borne in mind, that our Clergy (as Mr. Ward reminds us) not merely subscribe the Articles, but declare their assent to the Prayer-book, which must, accordingly, be regarded as our Church's standard commentary upon several of those points which the Articles have left in doubt⁷. But, on what may be called the Protestant side of the question, there is no corresponding interpreter of the Articles. The Homilies tell as much one way as the other; which cannot certainly be said of the Prayer-book.

To pass now from the composition of the Articles in 1552, to their revision and republication in 1562. If it be highly probable, both on *à priori*, and on historical, grounds, that their original framers drew them up with a studied reference to the views of those who retained their prepossessions in favour of the old Religion, this fact appears to be historically certain, in the case of Archbishop Parker, and the divines who remodelled them. Of these Dr. Heylin says,

“Their moderation is no less visible in declining all *unnecessary determinations*, which rather tended to the multiplying of controversies, and engendering of strifes. . . . So that they seem to have proceeded by those very rules which *King James* so much approved of in the Conference at Hampton Court. First, in not separating farther from the Church of

⁷ See “A Few More Words,” &c. by the Rev. W. G. Ward, p. 21.

Rome, than that Church had separated from what she was in her purest times ; 2dly, *in not stuffing the Articles with conclusions theological*, in which a latitude of judgment was to be allowed, as far as was consistent with peace and charity. As they omitted many whole Articles in King Edward's book, and qualified the expressions in some others, so were they generally very sparing of anything which was merely matter of modality, or *de modo* only. . . . *which rules being carefully observed by all the bishops, it was no wonder that they passed their votes without contradiction.*

"But in taking the subscription of the Lower House, there appeared more difficulty. For, though they all testified their consent unto them, yet, when subscription was required, *many of the Calvinian or Zwinglian Gospellers, possibly* ⁸ *some also which were inclined rather to the old Religion, and who found themselves unsatisfied in some particulars, had demurred to it* ⁹." He adds, that at length *all subscribed*. This appears doubtful ¹⁰; however, very many, at all events, subscribed, including Roman Catholics.

From all this it would appear, that the object, both of the original framers, and subsequent revisers,

⁸ This is remarkable. He speaks as if the objections had come rather from the other quarter. The passage is likewise important, as intimating that the Catholics (for it is a fact (vid. sup. p. 13) that many were in the Convocation,) *demurred* to the terms of the Articles; did not, I mean, regard them as a mere *unmeaning declaration of conformity*; yet they eventually yielded.

⁹ Hist. of Ref. Eliz. p. 159.

¹⁰ Strype, A. of R. c. xxviii.

of the Articles, was to form a National Church upon the most comprehensive basis ; consisting of all who could by any means be brought to subscribe its characteristic Formulary. Had they wished to exclude Roman Catholics, as persons holding views dangerous to the National Church, it is quite inconceivable why they should present (as they did,) the Articles, again and again, to the members of Convocation, (many of whom had offices in the Church in the preceding reign,) until all, or nearly all, had subscribed them. Had their purpose in the Articles been what the modern view supposes ; as soon as any Roman Catholic refused to sign, it would have been answered. They had framed their test, and it was successful. What then remained, but that the objectors should quit the Ministry ? Instead of which, they took the best means in their power to overcome the scruple¹. This certainly looks as if our divines did not try, like Luther and Calvin, to create a new Protestant community ; but sought rather to remodel the existing, and long-established, English Church. And, though it be true, that they made a grievous mistake in admitting into it the elements (as proved by subsequent events,) of certain disunion, still, on the other hand, they seem to have acted in a Catholic spirit towards the representatives of the ancient Faith ; not seeking to dispossess them of their place in the Church, provided only they were content to remain in it as *English*, not as *Roman*, Catholics ; to give up their adhe-

¹ See Heylin, p. 159.

sion to the Pope, *so far as it was inconsistent with the claims of the National Head*, retaining, the while, their belief in other points of the common Catholic Faith². And so matters remained for several years; and so they might have continued, but for later events, which brought on a crisis: and though, in themselves, (like the original differences with Rome under Henry VIII.,) of a political, rather than a religious, nature, produced an immediate, and most material, change in the visible relations of the Churches.

It does not fall within the scope of these observations, to pursue, what may be called the history of the Catholic doctrine in the later Church of England, beyond the period of the Reformation, as finally settled under Elizabeth. It is hereafter to be shown, that this view of the Articles, which it has been attempted to establish on historical grounds, and by which they are presumed to be (except where they refer to the direct subject of the Creeds,) a mere declaration against certain existing abuses, couched, occasionally, in highly Protestant language, but, in truth, clear of the doctrines which they appear to infringe, is, if not the very view, at least not materially unlike the view, upon which certain of our divines must be thought to have proceeded. For otherwise, we must accuse these divines of running wilfully counter to the doctrine of

² The Roman Catholics, of former times, who took the Oath of Supremacy, appear to have understood it, according to the interpretation proposed in Dr. Pusey's pamphlet on Tract 90, as a mere disclaimer of the Pope's *temporal* authority in this kingdom.

their Church, or that Church of most deplorable remissness, in not vindicating her own doctrine ; of remissness, indeed, to which she could not have yielded, without knowing for certain, that she was thereby precluding future generations from all hope of recovering, (at least without a second Reformation,) that (supposed) anti-catholic sense of the Articles, which she was thus suffering to escape.

But, before coming to this latter point, I may add, that the study of our later ecclesiastical annals will also furnish many indications of a like providential care exercised in the preservation of our Church from a committal, by any formal act, to uncatholic error.

The one exception to the truth of this remark, which, after some attention, I have been able to discover (if indeed it be, as for my own part I am certainly disposed to think that it is, an exception) is in what are called the Canons of Archbishop Laud, because ratified by a synod of the Church of England in his primacy. This, to the best of my knowledge and belief, is the only document of the nature of an ecclesiastical decision, (and the observation may be extended to *political* enactments, between the periods of the Reformation and Revolution of 1688²;) which condemns any *doctrine* of Rome, as distinct from the Papal claim of *jurisdiction* in this realm³. In the Canons of 1603, there is no hint of apprehension from

² See Appendix.

³ Such acts as that of the Seven Bishops, in 1688, not being acts of the Church of England, but of individuals, do not interfere with the above statement.

the influence of foreign Churches, except in the single injunction for the presentment of "*Recusants*" to the ordinary, to be by him reported to the Bishop, and so on to the king. Again, the synodical acts of our Church in 1604 and 1661, were both of them in a more Catholic direction than the proceedings at the time of the Reformation⁴. The case of Bishop Mountague involves a strong declaration on the Catholic side. On the other hand, the State of England, till the Revolution, did not attempt to meddle with the doctrinal profession of Roman Catholics, provided only it could obtain a guarantee for their *loyalty*⁵.

⁴ The re-introduction of the explanation at the end of the Communion Service, made on the latter of these occasions, may, at first sight, appear to be at variance with this remark; as it is, indeed, the only other instance I have observed of Roman doctrine being even *glanced at* by our Church during the above-mentioned interval. On consideration, however, it will be found even to support the view now taken; as the substitution of the term "*corporal* presence" for "*real* presence" was plainly an act "in a more catholic direction," and seems to fall in with the general habit of our Church, by condemning, not formal statements of doctrine, but popular corruptions*. Our assent to the Prayer-book of course involves no judgment as to the advisableness of this commentary upon our Service. Mr. Newman, however, has contended, in his Tract, that it may be understood in a sense altogether innocent.

⁵ The following are important testimonies, on both sides, to this fact. The first is from the work of a Protestant, (supposed to be Bishop Barlow,) published shortly before the Revolution. "It

* Cf. Dr. Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, &c., p. 35. Note. (See Appendix.)

And it is remarkable that the time which the State chose for an innovation upon her ancient policy in this respect, should have been the beginning of an epoch, during which, more than at any other period since the Reformation, the Church of England was disposed to act independently of the State. And a memorable fact it is, that the expiring energies of Convocation were directed, not against any high Mystery of the common Faith, under the name of superstition, but, contrariwise,

“ It is certain that these oaths” (of Supremacy and Allegiance) “ were primarily designed to be a sufficient test to distinguish Papists from others. And yet in either of them there is no mention of *doctrine*, but only those which concern government, that is, the external government both of Church and State. . . . I may add the constant profession and answer of all Protestant writers. Whensoever any complaint has been made of the severity used to Roman Catholics, it has been always said that they suffered not for religion, but for treason, &c.”—“ Considerations on the true way of suppressing Popery,” p. 35. See also pp. 47. 53. 73. 115.

On the other hand, the Secular Priests urged against the Jesuits in 1601 :—

“ If we at home, all of us, both Priests and people had possessed our souls in meekness and humility, honoured her Majesty, borne with the infirmities of the State, suffered all things, *and dealt as true Catholic Priests* . . . assuredly the State would have loved us, or, at least, borne with us : where there is one Catholic, there would have been ten . . . *for none were ever vexed that way simply*, for that he was either Priest, or Catholic, but because they were suspected . . . of traitorous designments.”—“ Important Considerations,” in a Collection of Tracts on the Penal Laws. London, 1675.

against the heresy, which passes through a degradation of the Sacraments into a dishonouring of Him who is their Life⁶.

But the Canons of 1640 present, as I may be allowed to say of an act of the then Church, in no way binding upon us, a somewhat perplexing combination of Catholic regulations, of an external kind, with strong disclaimers of the doctrine, which alone gives to such usages, as are therein enjoined, any value, or even any meaning. It would be a curious question, which this is not the place to pursue, whether much of the odium which our Church has, at different times incurred, on the ground of *formalism*, may not have been, in great measure, due to the want of a clearer recognition, on the part of her divines, of the intimate connexion subsisting between the forms and the spirit of true Religion; or, in other words, a fuller development of the Sacramental theory of the Church. Certainly, I would not be thought to defend the conduct of the Puritans; and yet, without referring more to one age than another, it seems both due to others, and salutary for ourselves, to consider, whether the opposition which our Church has, at different times, encountered from serious, although mistaken, persons, may not have arisen, in some degree, from a tendency, on the part of her members, to substitute mere outward conformity for vital unity, and to lay stress upon externals, without a clear enuncia-

⁶ Bishop Hoadly has been declared, on high authority, a Socinian.

tion of the principles upon which they depend⁷. But, to return to the Laudian Canons. I will not avail myself of the argument *ad hominem*,¹ by which this document might be disposed of, on the ground of its alleged want of authority. These Canons, though not, I believe, an act of Convocation, were certainly the act of a synod. I admit also, that, as far as they go, they appear to me to be at variance with the moderation of tone characteristic of the later Church of England. I am glad, for the sake of our Church, that she has renounced them. I am glad, for the sake of Christian unity, that, in subscribing the Articles, we are not required to declare assent to these, or any other, Canons. It is well known, that a Bishop of our Church suffered himself to be put under arrest rather than subscribe them. But Bishop Goodman, it is urged by many, was a Roman Catholic; and so, they would say, his objection to the Laudian Canons, is not to the point. Now if, when it is said that Bishop Goodman was a Roman Catholic, it be meant, that he formally joined the communion of Rome, this certainly was not the case. If he were a Roman Catholic in any other sense, then may such a Roman Catholic

⁷ And, surely, considering the very imperfect and ambiguous development of Catholic principles *generally*, even in the very best days of the Church of England since the Reformation, (not to speak of the painfully uneclesiastical character of proceedings in that æra itself,) we seem bound, in justice as well as charity, to make the largest allowance for those, who, in these latter days, have failed to recognize, in our Church, their appointed Mother in the Faith.

be in the communion, and even in the highest office, of the Church of England; which is very much to the present point. The higher we set Bishop Goodman's Catholicism, the more striking is the fact, that one who was conscientious enough to suffer penalties rather than subscribe the Laudian Canons, *should not have stumbled at the Articles*. How strange a phenomenon in the history of any Church, or, rather, (may we not say?) how wonderful a token of the Providence which has watched over ours, that catholic minds, perplexed by the inconsistencies of a catholic age, should be able to fall back upon the *Articles*, "the offspring of an uncatholic" one; and, again, that Protestants of a later time should have been the parties to extricate Catholics from obligations of which they are glad to be relieved, and even to contend for the Formulary, by which they are willing to be tried!

Whether it have arisen from the unwarrantable conduct of the Roman party in England, or from the recollection of ancient grievances, or from the desire of obviating, at any rate, the suspicion of Popery, or from an inadequate estimate of the importance of Catholic unity, or from whatever other cause; certain it is, that some even of our greater divines are accustomed to speak of the Roman Church in terms which it is hard to reconcile with their very close approximation, in parts of their writings, to Roman doctrine. And one reason, perhaps, why persons are startled by attempts, such as that inci-

dentally made in Tract 90, to harmonize parts of the Articles with the Decrees of Trent, is, that they derive their idea of our Church's position in respect of other branches of the Church Catholic, from the harsh and exclusive tone upon which many of her divines have been forced by circumstances, rather than from the actual amount of their testimony to Catholic Truth. It has not been unusual with us to speak almost as if *independence* were, *per se*, a greater boon to a Church, than oneness with the Catholic body; a sentiment, which appears to savour rather of Judaism, than of the gracious and comprehensive dispensation under which we live. With the intimations of our own Church, at least, (not to mention the explicit declarations of Scripture,) it would seem most agreeable, to consider that the especial work of the Holy Spirit in the Body Catholic is to make the "whole earth," which the author of confusion has split into parts, "of one language, and of one speech³."

But the stronger has been the temptation, whether arising out of our national peculiarities, or the pressure of external circumstances, to glory in our isolation, as a Church, instead of mourning for the sins of which it is the penalty; the deeper should be our gratitude to those of our divines, who, with Andrewes in England, and Forbes in Scotland, have made the

³ First Lesson for the morning of the Monday in Whitsun week.

restoration and re-union of Christendom, the object of their efforts, and of their prayers.

It may not be uninteresting, nor altogether irrelevant to the object of the present publication, to give some account of two remarkable attempts, (among others,) which have been made in different ages, and (as there is reason to suppose,) on different sides, of the Church, in this country, of a character somewhat similar to the Essay which has lately attracted so much notice and censure. The more recent of these very curious and striking dissertations it falls immediately within my present object to notice. The other is well worthy of the attentive consideration of English Churchmen, as the testimony of an impartial witness to the orthodoxy and catholicity of our own communion. I begin with the latter.

“Francis à Sancta Clara, a Dominican friar, of great learning and moderation, whose real name is Christopher Davenport, was chaplain to Queen Henrietta” (to whose influence we are indebted for one of the most catholic books in our Church, the “Hours of Devotion,” of Bishop Cosin,) “and afterwards to Catharine, Queen of Charles II. He was much noticed by the learned men of his day⁴. This ecclesiastic entertained the idea of the possibility of reconciling the Churches of England and Rome ;

⁴ He appears to have lived on terms of familiarity with Laud and Goodman.

and, with this view, had composed a short Treatise, in which he endeavoured to show that the Articles of the Church of England were in accordance with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, supporting his position from the writings of Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Mountague, Dr. White, and other learned Protestants ⁵."

The Treatise to which the above extract refers, is called "*Expositio Paraphrastica Confessionis Angliæ*," and is appended to a work on the subject of the Calvinistic controversy ⁶. Although written with a somewhat different object from Tract 90, it will be found to suggest an interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, in many respects strikingly similar to that put forward by Mr. Newman. As this fact has been publicly urged in objection to the Tract, I will at once admit the accuracy of the statement. This expositor speaks in the strongest language of the general catholicity of the English Articles. The great majority, including those on "*Predestination*," "*on Ministering in the Congregation*," and "*on Baptism*," he characterizes in terms such as the following.—"*Omnino catholicus*," "*optimam continet doctrinam*," "*conformis SS. Scripturis, doctrinæ sanctorum Pa-*

⁵ Brewer's Preface to "*the Court of King James I.*," by Dr. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester."

⁶ The title of the work is "*Deus, Natura, Gratia, sive Tractatus de Prædestinatione, &c. Auctore Francisco a Sancta Clara*," &c., published in 1634.

trum, et praxi Universalis Ecclesiæ.” In some very few cases (especially Art. xxxi. and xxxvii.) he admits a great *apparent* difficulty; but maintains that it is apparent only. In the case of others, (*e. g.* the Articles on the “Sacraments,” the “Marriage of Priests,” and the “Communion in both kinds”) he contends that there is hardly a colour for the objections which some Catholics had made to them. But it may not be amiss to give the view which this remarkable writer takes of some of those Articles, which have been recently so much canvassed. I will begin with that “on General Councils,” in which Sancta Clara sees none of that “*primâ facie* Protestantism” which so perplexes Mr. Ward; but rather considers, with Dr. Pusey, that the very wording of the Article is strictly catholic. He thus comments.—

Art. xxi. “General Councils may not (*non possunt*) be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes.”

“These words⁷,” he observes, “seem to be confirmed by the authority of Jerome, who asks (*Apol. 2. cont. Ruffin.*) in objection to a certain Council, what emperor *commanded* (*jussit*) ‘the assembling of this Synod?’ as if meaning, that the ‘commandment’ of the Emperor was necessary. And thus in the case of all the ancient Councils (to make a general statement) this rule was observed.

⁷ My readers are probably aware that Sancta Clara’s work is in Latin. The translation here given is rather free, but will, I believe, be found accurate.

Speaking abstractedly, (that is to say, viewing the matter as a question of *divine right*,) Councils *may* be gathered together *without* the interference of Princes, as Jerome would not have denied. But *per accidens*, (that is to say, taking into account the circumstances of time, place, &c.) the consent, and even the command, of Princes is a preliminary requisite.

“Again” (he continues) “the words which follow, present no greater difficulty. ‘Things pertaining to God,’ is an expression of great latitude. That General Councils may err in things *not necessary to salvation* (quæ fidem aut mores ad salutem necessarios non concernunt) is the common judgment of our doctors Let none, then, quarrel with this clause “even in things,” &c. That General Councils can err in things *necessary to salvation*, the Article does not assert. That they may err in minor matters, Catholics do not deny.

“The last words of the Article express the judgment of the Church in modern, as well as ancient, times. For Councils cannot *make* a proposition heretical, which before was otherwise; neither can they *coin* (eudere) an Article of Faith. Their province is, to give an *explicit* force to the *implicit* sense of Scripture and the Apostolic words, (ex abditionibus SS. locis et Apostolorum dictis, veritatem eruere) that so (as Lirinensis has it) a later generation may more clearly understand what a former more indistinctly believed This is all the Church proposes, when she is said to determine (definire) certain truths. For she rests (innititur) not on any fresh revelations, but on those of the ancient time, which are *involved* (latitantibus) in the Scriptures, and words of the Apostles,” &c.

The view which this acute and learned divine takes of Art. XXII. is as follows :

Art. "The Romish doctrine concerning the Invocation of Saints is a fond thing," &c.

"Words," (proceeds the expositor) "doubtless of a very severe aspect. But observe ; what the terms of this Article condemn, is not Invocation of Saints *simply in itself*, (as is evident,) but the *Romish doctrine of Invocation*.

"What then is this Romish doctrine? or rather, what is the Protestant account of the Roman doctrine? For the question is, not what the so-called 'Romanists,' have said, but what Protestants have supposed them to say. Calvin (Inst. l. iii. c. 20) affirms, that we invoke the Saints as gods. Andrewes, in his answer to Cardinal Perron, supposes that our prayers are directed to the Saints as ultimate objects of worship, and without any qualification (*ultimatas et absolutas*) and, as it were, to so many divinities. And this he tries to show from the *harmony*, not of our doctors, but of our hymns (*concentu, non consensu*).

"On the whole, then, the Anglican Confession determines nothing against the Catholic Faith, but rather condemns a profane and heathen doctrine, with which the Church is not fairly chargeable."

Here this commentator has certainly overlooked important considerations connected with the subject, to which Mr. Newman has drawn attention ; especially the value of our Article as a protest against actual abuses, and as a warning against "*peril* of idolatry." So far, however, as this interpretation considers that "not every doctrine, but only the *Romish* doctrine," of Invocation, is condemned by the Article, it agrees with that of the Tract. The question, upon which Mr. Newman and Sancta Clara appear to differ, is

that of the extent to which the Church, in whose communion certain abuses exist, is committed, by *non-interference*, to the *virtual* sanction of what she formally disavows.

This Roman Catholic interpreter takes the same view with Mr. Newman, of expressions in our Articles, which, denying of certain practices or institutions, that they are *Scriptural*, in the sense of being *ordained in Scripture*, do not deny, that they may be, and are, obligatory, as matters of ecclesiastical regulation. Speaking of Art. XXVIII., towards the close of which are the words “by *Christ's ordinance*,” he observes,

“What is not by CHRIST formally commanded, may yet by the Church be rightly instituted.”

Again, with reference to Art. XXXII.

“Bishops, priests, and deacons, are not *commanded* to vow celibacy; they are not required, *jure divino*, to abstain from marriage; therefore, as far as ‘divine right’ is concerned, they *may* marry, both lawfully and validly. This is the more common opinion in the schools, and the Article makes no farther assertion.”

The important connexion between the two parts of Art. XXXI. “on the One Oblation,” is clearly pointed out in this commentary.

Art. “The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world . . . *wherefore* the *sacrifices of masses*,” &c.

Obs. "The former part, so far as it relates to the affirmative proposition, is no subject of controversy. And, where the Article proceeds to a denial of all satisfaction for the guilt of sin, the Oblation of the Cross excepted; we must understand that the whole of that which is affirmed of CHRIST, is denied to any other; in other words, that none, except CHRIST, can, by any action or suffering, wash away sin, that is, to the exclusion of CHRIST," (*præscindendo CHRISTUM*).

Hence he concludes, that the Article does not contravene the doctrine of those English divines, who consider that the Eucharistic Ordinance involves a true, although a commemorative Sacrifice.

The other work, to which I have referred, as bearing upon the subject of Mr. Newman's Tract, is called "An Essay towards Catholic Communion, by a Minister of the Church of England." It was published in 1715; and, being avowedly an attempt towards reconciliation with Rome, attracted, as was natural at that particular time, the notice of the government. A warrant appears to have been issued from the Secretary of State's office for the seizure of the author's papers, and the arrest of his person; under a suspicion, apparently, that he was in league with the Pretender. It was more than insinuated by adverse parties, that he was actually in communion with Rome at the time; but the internal evidence of his book, is, in the opinion of competent and most impartial judges whom I have consulted, so

strongly the other way, that I am bound, in honesty, as well as charity, to give him credit for his professions.

The object of this writer is to show, by quotations from the works of approved divines of the Church of England, especially Bishops Andrewes, Forbes, and Mountague, the coincidence between the statements of our own theologians, and the authoritative declarations of the Council of Trent, upon various points of doctrine and practice ; as, for instance, the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Intermediate State, Intercession for the Dead, and the Reverence due to Images and Relics. Accordingly, this Essay is alone enough to take from the present undertaking all pretension to originality. However, my object, so far, falls short of that of this writer, that, while he seems to consider that the Church of England *teaches* certain doctrines, all at which I aim, is to show, that she cannot be *proved to repudiate them*. And of this Essay, ingenious and (on the whole,) conclusive as it is, I am ready to admit, that it seems to me, for the reason I have just given, partial, if not disingenuous. Also, I will add, that, in the extracts which the writer has made from the works of English theologians, (the most important of which, I have verified, and find correct,) he has not always been sufficiently observant of *collateral* qualifications in the context of what he cites. Altogether then, I will say of this very curious book, that, while no person ought to take any decisive step in the present controversy, till he has carefully

read, and fairly weighed it ; I am, for my own part, inclined to dispense with the evidence which it furnishes to the point of these observations, from feeling, not so much, I may sincerely say, that it is questionable, as that it is superfluous.

The extract, which, among others, I am about to make in support of the statement to the proof of which these observations are directed, shall come from a quarter which there can be no difficulty in admitting. It shall come, not from this Catholic Essay, but from the Anglican Reply to it. Of this, then, I will now say a few words. The Essay, in question, is accompanied by Observations intended (according to the profession of the title-page,) to “detect the mystery, and to expose and defeat the design, of the original work.” The writer of these Observations evidently supposed, that the author of the Essay was a Roman Catholic in disguise, and, accordingly, does not spare him. He, then, at least, must be considered an impartial witness. Yet we shall presently see, how far even *he* goes on the side of the Tract.

The “Observations” in question I have been enabled to trace to Nathaniel Spinckes, A. M., Rector of Peakirk cum Glynton, in the county of Northampton, and diocese of Peterborough and of St. Martin, Sarum, and also Prebendary of that Cathedral ; of which dignity he was deprived, in the episcopate of Bishop Burnet, A.D. 1690, on the ground of his refusal to take the oaths to King William III.

Of the remaining divines, by whose writings I

have profited in the present attempt, there is but one of whom I feel it necessary to say any thing in this place.

William Forbes, D.D., flourished in the times of James I. and Charles I., and was appointed first Bishop of Edinburgh in the reign of the latter. He was a native of Aberdeen, and entered the Marischal College in that city at the age of twelve. After completing his academical career, he visited the continent of Europe, and studied, for some time, in the German universities. He was deeply versed in the theology of the early Church, and accurately acquainted with the original languages of Holy Scripture, especially Hebrew. It is needless to add, that he was master of Latin. Upon his return to Scotland, he entered the sacred Ministry, and laboured in his calling with extraordinary zeal. King James I. being at Aberdeen, Forbes was chosen, with others, to confer with that monarch on matters of academical privilege; and received the degree of D.D., by royal mandate. He was afterwards, successively, Principal of the College, and Rector of the University. On the visit of King Charles I. to Scotland in 1633, Forbes was nominated to fill the See of Edinburgh, endowed by that monarch. Immediately after his consecration, he was attacked by serious illness, which ended mortally in the third month of his episcopate, and forty-ninth year of his age.

His principal work, to which I am now indebted,

is entitled “*Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum*,” and is avowedly an attempt to effect a reconciliation with Rome, on the basis of the common Catholic Faith. It was found among his papers, and published after his decease. The following is the testimony of an intimate acquaintance to the usefulness and excellence of his Ministerial life.

“Inter alios eminebat Gulielmus Forbesius ex opere quodam posthumo, *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum*, &c. inscripto, erudito orbi cognitus, inter primos sui ævi eruditos.—Vir, vitæ sanctimoniâ, humilitate cordis, gravitate, modestiâ, temperantiâ, orationis et jejunii frequentiâ, bonorum operum praxi, industriâ pauperum curâ, clinicorum crebrâ visitatione et consolatione, et omnifariâ virtute Christianâ, inter optimos primitivæ Ecclesiæ Patres annumerandus. In concionando ad populum fervens adeo ut auditorum mentes et affectus raperet; doctrinâ et eruditione insignis, sublimato pollens judicio, memoriâ etiam tenacissimâ (de quo vulgo dictum, quod ignoraret quid sit oblivisci), Veritatis et pacis amantissimus, ac proinde, rerum controversarum momentis acutissime expensis et pensatis, nulli parti addictus, partium lites componere, saltem mitigare, satagebat.” Geo. Garden in vitâ R. V. Joh. Forbesii, p. 19. inter Forbesii opera, vol. 1.

Having now, as I hope, sufficiently cleared the way for the following extracts, I will add a few concluding words in explanation.

If, in the preceding remarks, there be any expression which seems even so much as to imply

the desire of reflecting upon past transactions, or needlessly reviving exhausted discussions; if any, which can be thought to betoken a defective appreciation of the difficulties of others, or an intention of throwing obstacles in the way of their conscientious discharge of duty, I heartily lament such expression, and wish it recalled.

Much, surely, there is, both in the actual appearances of the Church at this time, and in the position and circumstances of those who, in their endeavours to defend her, have drawn upon themselves the opposition of zealous men, to create mutual sympathy, even where, unhappily, there can be but little agreement. It is impossible any longer to shut our eyes, even where we may wish it, to the fact, that certain views of theology have gained an influence in this country, which may well alarm those who think them essentially wrong, and must needs make all anxious, but those who think them essentially right. So far as any person sees in these views, not a mere fortuitous collection of opinions, some true, others false, others indifferent; but a compact, harmonious, and living system, which, if it be not divine (as its upholders maintain) must be the antagonist of what is divine, I cannot but admire that person's sagacity, however I may deplore his conclusion. There is neither wisdom, nor fairness, in denying that a certain course of teaching *does* tend to what the parties who make the assertion mean by "Popery," that is, to the *full* and *consistent* carrying out of the Sacra-

mental theology; the doctrine, namely, that *the Church Catholic, as the Instrument of the Holy Spirit, and the Representative of our Lord in His Kingly, Priestly, and Prophetical Offices, is the one (ordained) channel of blessing from God to man, and means of access from man to God.* And, no doubt also, so far as the impressive and consolatory idea of a Visible Church is more fully realized in Rome, than among ourselves, the craving, which this course of instruction has been chiefly instrumental in awakening, *tends* even to Rome; which, however, is very different from saying, or necessarily implying, either that it *ought* to *terminate* there, or that it *will*. But if by "Popery" be meant, some form of superstition and idolatry, then not they only, who seek to *advance*, but they also, who do not *actively resist*, the present movement, (being supposed conscientious men,) must be understood to intimate, by the very fact of such advocacy, or acquiescence, their belief that it tends to no such result, except in the way of perversion or abuse.

Again, on the other hand, although the defenders of the Tract imply, by the very circumstance of defending it, that they consider the difficulties greater on the side of those who oppose its interpretation of the Articles, than on their own, yet few of them, I imagine, go so far as to say, that their own side is altogether without difficulty. Mr. Newman, for one, has never intimated that he regards the construction for which he pleads, as the *obvious* one; quite the

reverse. Now the confession of *primâ facie* difficulty on the one side, is a virtual admission of the claim to sympathy and forbearance on the other. At all events, I will express my own firm persuasion, that in points such as those upon which the present controversy has chiefly turned, there is no side in the Church of England, at this moment, the representatives of which are, under existing circumstances, in any situation to dogmatize or condemn. It is one thing to feel, that there is no safety but in the consistent following out of one line of doctrine, to the exclusion of all others; and, again, that our Church, fairly considered, presents no insurmountable barrier to the pursuit of Truth, even in its remoter bearings, in that direction; and quite another, to deal hardly with those, be they without, or within, the pale of the Church established, who, whether from the prejudices of education, or the prevalence of traditionary impressions, coinciding with the absence of any unambiguous witness on the other side, on the part of our Church herself, are bent on carrying out, with greater or less consistency, the principles which it has all along been assumed that the English Reformers themselves were not unwilling to encourage.

So little, happily, does sympathy, in the present instance, depend on perfect agreement in opinion, that, rather, where there is the less agreement, there is, for some reasons, the greater sympathy. It is easier, I mean, to *understand*, and, so far, to feel with, those who, looking at the present movement in its

true character, as part of a consistent whole, regard it as simply evil, than with those who view it with mixed feelings, or with no feelings at all. Wherein such persons esteem it a deep philosophy, and not a mere interesting literature; an absorbing principle, and not a mere transient excitement; and wherein they look below its superficial appearances, into its solid grounds, and beyond its present manifestations, to its undeveloped capabilities, they take, as I must think, a truer and more earnest view of the subject, than those who pronounce a hesitating and qualified sentence upon certain parties and proceedings; much more than those who seek to talk the matter off, as a mere ephemeral topic, or hush it up, as a mere inconvenient disturbance. On the other hand, and in the way of compensation, it must be remembered, that where there seems less of consistency and reality to command our admiration, there is also less of what we must consider serious error to excite our sorrow. And again, when it is said that we may not *understand* how this or that person is able to reconcile certain opinions, or courses, which seem to *us* contradictory, still this is very different from charging him with culpable inconsistency. Which of us is any judge of another, or can attempt to try his mind by any known rule? It is most certain, indeed, that truth and falsehood, and, therefore, consistency and inconsistency, have a nature of their own, independent of the mind to which they are accidentally subjected; but, important as it is to recol-

lect this, for the purposes of faith, it is, for the purposes of charity, equally important to consider, that, as respects the *moral probation of individuals*, this essential nature admits of incalculable modification from unknown varieties of circumstance. At all events, so it is, that, among the opponents of the doctrine in question, the vast majority are, if I may not say happily inconsistent, at least happily unprepared, to oppose it without reluctance or reserve. Few, comparatively, are ready to say of the Catholic movement, that it is simply evil, and so to throw themselves, heart and soul, into the antagonist system. And those, who are not so disposed, but who, I really believe, were they required to make their choice, would at once close with *mere* Catholicism rather than *mere* Protestantism, I ask, with every distrust of myself, but none of my cause, to try and realize their position, and their objects; what they dread, and what they believe; and why so believing, they so dread; and what, above all, it is, that they mean to build upon the ruins of what they seek to cast down; and what is the amount of their agreement with those whom they join for a present purpose; and how, except there be indeed some vital bond of union among them, they can hope to replace a doctrine which is *certainly* real, certainly influential, certainly productive of the fruits of holiness, charity, self-denial, and all that *seems* like the religion of the Gospel, by any thing equally real, equally influential equally (may I say it without offence?) *evangelical*?

Let it be considered, that the great religious system which, for a long time, bore, and, so far as it comprehended portions (as surely it did) of essential truth, *deserved*, that sacred name; which, in what it contained of high and holy, was, no doubt, God's instrument for awakening us to a sense of our responsibilities, and of infusing life and warmth, where before, it may be feared, was too often the mere cold profession of orthodoxy; let it be considered that this system, once to all appearance so compact, and beyond question so popular and attractive, is now, as a system, manifestly breaking to pieces. What of it is earthly, is finding its level. What of it is earnest, self-denying, and affectionate, is uniting itself with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, which alone, in its completeness, (such as I am far from saying has yet been realized amongst ourselves, and which, when realized, will draw to its side whatever of good amongst us is now kept back by the want of such due developement,) provides an adequate scope, and a reverential direction, for the feelings of devotedness and brotherly love.

Considerations such as these do not, of course, hold good upon the supposition that the Church of England is unambiguous in her witness against the theology in question, and imposes upon her members a clear obligation to withstand it. But to those, who are doubtful upon this point, they may fitly be suggested, in the way, not of an adequate motive, but of a restraining scruple; and not as reasons of

mere expediency, but rather as providential intimations, which, though they cannot avail to overthrow a settled, and fully realized, conclusion, may well create a presumption against an ill-defined view, or come in arrest of a headlong judgment, or remove (which is rather their bearing upon the subject of these remarks) a preliminary obstacle to the examination of the proper evidence.

I will only add, that the following extracts by no means pretend to be more than *specimens* of the teaching of English divines upon the points in question. And, again, that, while taking to myself the undivided responsibility of the present publication, I desire to express my sincere thanks to the Rev. J. S. Brewer, of King's College, for the assistance I have received from him in collecting materials; and to my much-esteemed coadjutor in the ministrations of Margaret Chapel, the Rev. W. U. Richards, for the advantages I have derived through his official connexion with the British Museum.

London,
July 8, 1841.

It being quite beyond the scope of the present undertaking to bear out the interpretation of the Tract upon any other subjects, than those in which it has been most generally questioned, the following extracts will be found to refer chiefly to the doctrines brought forward in the Protest of the Four Tutors, and most frequently dwelt upon in the progress of the controversy, by opponents of the Tract.

I.

THE EUCHARIST A COMMEMORATIVE SACRIFICE FOR QUICK AND DEAD.

*Bishop Andrewes. Answer to XVIIIth chapter of Card.
Perron.*

“THE Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament, and as a Sacrifice. 2. A Sacrifice is proper and applicable only to divine worship. 3. The Sacrifice of Christ’s death did succeed to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. 4. The Sacrifice of Christ’s death is available for present, absent, living, dead, (yea, for them that are yet unborn). 5. When we say the dead, we mean, it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and all, (because we are all members of one Body): these no man will deny.

“In a word, we hold with Saint Augustine in the very same chapter which the Cardinal citeth, ‘quod hujus Sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi, per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in Passione Christi, per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi, per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur¹.’”

Farther on :

“If we agree about the matter of Sacrifice, there will be no difference about the Altar. The holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, (in the representation of the breaking the Bread, and pouring forth the Cup,) the same is fitly called an Altar : which again is as fitly called a Table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else, but a distribution and an application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers. The same Saint Augustine, that, in the place alleged, doth term it an Altar, saith in another place, ‘Christus quotidie pascit. Mensa ipsius est illa in medio constituta. Quid causæ est, ô audientes, ut mensam videatis, et ad epulas non accedatis?’ The same Nyssen, in the place cited, with one breath calleth it *θυσιαστήριον*, that is, an Altar; and *ἐπὶ τράπεζα*, that is, the Holy Table.

“Which is agreeable also to the Scriptures. For, the altar in the Old Testament, is, by Malachi, called ‘mensa Domini³.’ And of the Table in the New Testament, by the Apostle it is said, ‘habemus Altare⁴.’ Which, of what matter it be, whether of stone, as Nyssen⁵; or of wood, as Optatus, it skills not. So that the matter of Altars makes no difference in the face of our Church⁶.”

¹ Aug. de Civitate, lib. 17. c. 20.

² Hom. 46, de Verbis Domini secundum Joannem.

³ Mal. i. 7.

⁴ Heb. xiii.

⁵ Nyssen. de Bapt.

⁶ For additional testimonies of English divines on this subject, see Tracts for the Times, No. 81.

Again, *ibid.* ix.

“For offering and prayer for the dead, there is little to be said against it. It cannot be denied, that it is ancient.”

Thorndike. Just Weights and Measures, pp. 106, 107.

“BUT the practice of the Church in interceding for them (the Dead) at the celebration of the Eucharist, is so general, and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture; but that the same aspersion will seem to take hold of the common Christianity.”

Then, after saying (so far with Mr. Newman) that such practice does not imply the “Romish doctrine of Purgatory,” he proceeds:—

“In the meantime, then, what hinders them to receive *comfort and refreshment, rest and peace, and light*, (by the visitation of God, by the consolation of His Spirit, by His good Angels), to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through, during the time of it? And though there be hope for those that are most solicitous to live and die good Christians, that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; yet, because their condition is *uncertain*, and where there is *hope of the better, there is fear of the worse*; therefore the Church hath always assisted them with the prayers of the living both for their *speedy trial*, (which all blessed souls desire), and for their easy absolution and discharge with glory before God, together with the accomplishment of their happiness in the receiving of their bodies. Now all members of the Church Triumphant in heaven, according to the degree of their favour with God, abound also with love to his Church Militant on earth. And though they know not the necessities of particular persons, without

particular revelation from God; yet they know there are such necessities, so long as the Church is militant on earth. Therefore it is certain, both that they offer continual prayers to God for their necessities, and that their prayers must needs be of great force and effect with God, for the assistance of the Church Militant in this warfare. Which if it be true, the Communion of Saints will necessarily require that all who remain solicitous of their trial, be assisted by the prayers of the living, for present comfort and future rest."

Bishop Forbes. (Considerationes Modestæ, &c. p. 460. et seq. ed. 12mo. 1658.)

"Missam non tantum esse Sacrificium Eucharisticum et honorarium, sed etiam propitiatorium, sano sensu dici posse, recte affirmant Romanenses moderatores; non quidem ut *efficiens* propitiationem, et remissionem peccatorum (*quod Sacrificio Crucis proprium est*) sed ut eam jam factam *impetrans* quomodo oratio, cujus hoc Sacrificium species est, propitiatoria dici potest."

Again, (p. 463.)

"Sacrificium autem hoc Cœnæ non solum propitiatorium esse, ac pro peccatorum quæ a nobis quotidie committuntur, remissione, offerri posse modo prædicto Corpus Dominicum, sed etiam esse impetratorium, omnis generis beneficiorum, ac pro iis etiam rite offerri, *licet Scripturæ diserte et expresse* non dicant, Patres tamen unanimi consensu Scripturas sic intellexerunt, quemodmodum ab aliis fuse demonstratum est, et Liturgiæ omnes veteres, non semel inter offerendum, orandum præcipiunt pro pace, pro copia fructuum, et pro aliis id genus temporalibus beneficiis, ut nemini ignotum est."

Also, (p. 465.)

"Quod toties hoc cap. Sacrificium quod in Cœna peragi-

tur, non tantum Eucharisticum esse, sed etiam sano sensu propitiatorium, et plurimis *non solum viventibus, sed etiam defunctis*, prodesse, quomodo scilicet oratio, cujus hoc Sacrificium species est, propitiatoria, &c. dici potest, confirmat Bellarm. ipse de Missa, l. ii. c. 5. Sacrificium, inquit, simile est orationi, quod attinet ad efficientiam; oratio enim non solum prodest oranti, sed etiam iis, pro quibus oratur. Unde manducatio Eucharistiæ quæ fit a Sacerdote, ut est Sacramenti susceptio, soli sumentis prodest, ut autem est Sacrificii consummatio, prodest illis omnibus, pro quibus oblatum est Sacrificium."

Again, (*ib.* p. 267.)

"Mos orandi et offerendi pro defunctis antiquissimus et in universa Christi Ecclesia ab ipsis ferme Apostolorum temporibus receptissimus, ne amplius a Protestantibus ut illicitus, vel saltem ut inutilis, rejiciatur," &c.

And (on the especial subject of Prayers for the Dead.);

Spinckes. Observations on Essay towards Catholic Communion, p. 103.

"Having already written and published a 'Discourse of Prayers for the Dead' . . . and I think sufficiently proved the practice and tradition thereof in the Church, truly Catholic, I shall here only add 'to what I before and this author here have written, that, besides the authors mentioned already, the learned and devout Bishop Andrewes was of the same opinion, as appears by his 'Private Devotions,' printed at the Theatre at Oxford, in Greek and Latin, licensed by Dr. Bathurst, Vice-chancellor, 1673, and commended in the Epistle to the reader as having in it no heresy or dangerous opinion, but that he may safely read it all, and repeat it as his own a thousand times before God. Wherein besides what may be observed elsewhere, he prays

in this manner, ‘Thou who art Lord, both of the living and of the dead Give to the living mercy and grace, and to *the dead rest and light perpetual*’.

“To censure prayers for the dead, because not expressly enjoined in the Scriptures, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Scriptures themselves (2 Thess. ii. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 17, &c.) and with reason, because the Christian religion being planted in all places by word, order, and practice, and *no where by writing*, and planted by so many several persons, in so many several places, and *all agreeing in the use of it in the most solemn part of the Christian worship from the beginning, and so unanimously, that I never yet could meet with any competent evidence of any one Church which ever received it after their first foundation, or from any other than their founders. So that it stands upon equal evidence with the Scriptures themselves.*”

II.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Bishop Mountague. Invocation of Saints, p. 58.

“IT is true, and must not be denied, the Roman Church in her *doctrine* (for, and concerning *practice*, it is other-

⁶ These, it need hardly be observed, are the words of the Breviary, “Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine, et Lux perpetua illuceat eis.”

The following prayer for departed benefactors, in whose kind offices we constantly participate, (from the “Benediction of the Board” in the Roman Breviary, where its meaning is illustrated by the context,) is still kept up in one of our Colleges:—

“Retribuere dignare, Domine, omnibus, nobis bona facientibus, propter Nomen Tuum vitam æternam.”

wise) doth not impair, or impeach the sure, firm, and fastest mediation, the peculiar work of Christ Jesus, or appoint propitiators in his place, who alone, as Allsufficient, paid the price of our redemption, and made up without assistants or concurrents, the alone, absolute Atonement, by His real and perfect Satisfaction, betwixt God and man. . . .

It is false which is imputed, if yet it be imputed, and laid unto their charges, *that they have many gods, or many lords*. That they call upon Saints, as upon God, to help them. That they mention not Christ, but Saints, in their devotions. They do not deny *Call upon me*. In their doctrine and opinion, Invocation is peculiar unto God alone, as a part of the eternal moral duty which man ever doth owe unto God, his Maker and Protector in all his ways. Invocation, I mean, in a proper sense; it is Advocacion and Intercession only which they give unto Saints; *which act is sometimes called Invocation in a large extent*, as it passeth, and is directed, from man to them. Their help, with David, only standeth in the Name of the Lord, who hath made both heaven and earth.

“For better evidence in this point, the question controverted *inter partes*, may be limited, or rather explained, thus.—Invocation, as was touched, is a word of ambiguous signification; as most words are, because there are more things than words, subsistances than names to call them by. It is taken specially for to *call upon Me*, as Him upon whom we absolutely rely: at least *ultimate*⁷ in that kind. It is also used for to *call unto*, as to helps, assistants, or advocates in suit, when in time of trouble and necessity we have cause to come and call on God, directing our prayers ever *prima intentione* unto Him. When, therefore, we talk of Invocation of Saints, and dispute concerning Praying

⁷ Cf. Sancta Clara, ut sup. p. 39.

unto Saints, we must understand Invocation so, as directed unto them only, as assistants, and mediators only of intercession; and therefore not to be invocated, or called upon, *in the same sense and terms* as God Almighty is, the Author and Donor of every good giving: nor to be implored as Christ Jesus is, the only Mediator of redemption and Meritorious Advocate of intercession. Therefore, having occasion and cause to *call Me in time of trouble*, they employ not *te ad me*, man unto God, immediately, but do it *secundario*, and *by mediators*. This is not unlawful in itself.

Bishop Forbes, (ut supra, p. 299, 230).

“Nudam angelorum et sanctorum compellationem qua moneantur et invitentur, ut nobiscum, et pro nobis, Deum orent, (quomodo a piis hic viventibus petimus, ut pro nobis apud Deum intercedant, suas preces nostris conjungant, iisdemque nostram salutem sedulo commendent,) cum Protestantibus iis, qui paulo cautius et distinctius aliis in hoc argumento loqui amant, Advocationem potius quam Invocationem [*a calling unto*, rather than a *calling upon*^s,] appellamus. . . . Advocationem appellare malunt R. Montacutus, [vid. sup.] J. Usserius, Arch. Armach. cont. Jesuit., ut alios omittam. Alioqui, in *significatione vocis lata*, nihil vetat Invocationem appellari.”

Again (quoting Bishop Montague), p. 327.

“R. Montacutus respondens ad factum Justinæ Virginis a Nazianzeno (orat. in Cyprianum) memoratum, ‘Si illi (Rom. sc.) hoc facerent ipsimet, et proselytos docerent facere quod fecit virgo hæc, ad Deum scilicet, et Christum primo confugere, et deinceps ex abundanti sive ad-

^s His own words.

juverit, sive non adjuverit, in auxilium vocare B. V. Mariam, S. Petrum, &c. εἴ τις αἰσθησις, ut loquitur Naz. &c. non contenderemus. In Eccl. Rom. praxi res longe aliter se habet ¹.”

III.

REVERENCE DUE TO IMAGES AND RELICS.

Bishop Mountague.

“PINGITE, sequemur. Sculpite, suspicimus; Abrahami sacrificaturientis imaginem, Christi in Cruce pendentis Passionem, typum, illum, hoc, complementum. Quis negat?

¹ The following words in the Morning Prayer of Bishop Andrewes border very closely upon Invocations to Angels and Saints *for aid, and spiritual strength.*

Angelum pacis, fidum ducem,
Custodem animarum et corporum
Castrametantem in circuitu meo
Et mihi salutaria semper *suggerentem*,
Concede, Domine.

To this may be added Bishop Ken's prayer (quoted in the 2nd edition of Tract 90), that the guardian angel may

“His love angelical *instil*.”

But too much stress ought not to be laid upon the words of metrical Hymns *on either side.*

To go to quite a different subject, what Roman Catholic would express himself more strongly than the judicious and popular George Herbert on the subject of the Real Presence?

“At Communion times the Priest is in great confusion, as being *not only to receive GOD, but to break and administer HIM.*”—Country Parson, C. xxii.

nos imitatur in Ecclesiis nostris; intuemur libenter, et usurpamus oculis; ex intuitu ad συμπάθειαν commovemur, et ad detestationi conjunctam σύννυξιν de peccatis nostris, in Judæos vehementius inflammamur; Christi passionum tormentis compatimur, et simul in memoriam revocamus non fuisse dolorem sicut dolorem Ejus; Cujus illa, ut Græci in suis liturgicis loquuntur, ἄγνωστα παθήματα, vocem illam dolorificam expresserunt, ‘Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid Me dereliquisti?’ atque hinc ab intuitu isto invitati ad amandum amore nostro amorem Illius excitamur, Qui propter amorem nostri, ut Augustinus loquitur, semetipsum ἐκένωσεν, exinanivit. . . . Hæc et hujuscemodi nemo nostrum negat, saltem negare nemo potest, ex intuitu efficacius ad animum et intimos cordium affectus descendere, eoque magis commendantur, in usu posita quotidiano, quo, tardiores cum simus ad hæc magnalia Dei recolenda, pluribus indigemus et efficacissimis adjumentis.”—Orig. Eccles. vol. ii. p. 102.

“The Church of England condemneth not the historical use of Images. The Homily that seems to condemn all making of Images is to be understood with a restriction of making them to an unlawful end.”—Appello Cæsarem, p. 258.

“Civilem usum [imaginum] ac moralem statuo ad intuitum ac invitationem, nullum religiosum ad adorationem; an vero ad intuitum et invitationem constituerentur in locis sacris et sacratis conventibus destinatis, sunt qui negant, ex Origene, Arnobio, Minutio Felice; sed non persuadent. Successerunt tempora, cum frequentius in templis locarentur; sed tantum ad intuitum et invitationem. Tempora illa laudamus, et imitatur. Admiramur ingentes illas animas quæ, ceu luminaria, orbem ecclesiasticum illustrarunt, et cum Carolo Magno ad Hadrianum primum, ‘permittimus Sanctorum Images, quicunque eas formare voluerit, tam in Ecclesia

quam extra, propter amorem Dei, et Sanctorum Ejus; *adorare* prohibemus; frangere vel destruere eas etiamsi quis voluerit, non permittimus.' Hæc ille Carolus Magnus. Hæc ille, ita nos." — Origines Ecclesiasticæ², vol. ii. p. 102.

Thorndike.

"Now, granting that Epiphanius and the Council of Elvira did hold all Images in churches dangerous for idolatry, (of which there is appearance,) it is manifest that they were afterwards admitted all over. And there might be *jealousy of offence in having Images in churches before idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance*³. But no manner of appearance that images in history should occasion idolatry to those Images in them that hold them the Images of God's creatures, such as are those Images which represent histories of the Saints, out of the Scriptures, or other relations of unquestionable credit. The second Council of Nice seems to have brought in, or authorized, addresses to solitary Images of Saints, placed upon pillars for that purpose; whereof there is much mention in the records of it. But to the Images of Saints, there can be no idolatry, so long as men take them for Saints, that is God's creatures, much less to the Images of

² This was his last work, published several years after his acquittal by the Bishops.

³ This view, (intimated also by Bishop Mountague in the preceding passage) seems to meet the objection which has been drawn against the use of Images in later times of the Church, from the disuse of them in the earlier. Surely the Church has power to order all such matters according to circumstances, and, in such cases, her practice at any one particular time (though, accidentally, more ancient) will be no guide whatever for other times.

our Lord. For it is the honour of our Lord, and not of His image.

“For indeed and in truth, *it is not the Image, but the Principal, that is honoured, by the honour that is said to be done to the Image*, because it is done before the Image. The fountain and utensils of the Church were honoured, in the spotless times of the Church, as consecrated to God’s service; though the honour of them, being incapable of honour for themselves, was manifestly, and without any scruple, the honour of God. But Images, so long as they were used to no farther intent than the ornament of churches, the remembrance of holy histories, and the raising of devotion; thereby, (as at the first they were used by the Church,) came in the number of things consecrated to God’s service. And that Council was never of force in the West till the usurped power of the Pope brought it in by force. Nor did the Western Church, when it refused the Council, discharge the having of Images in churches upon those reasons, and to those purposes which I have declared. So far they remain still justifiable. For he that *sees the whole Church on the one side, and only Calvin on the other side*, hath he not cause to fear, that they who *make them idolaters without cause will themselves appear schismatics* in the sight of God for it? For what are they else, who please themselves in a strange kind of *negative superstition*, that they cannot serve God, if they serve Him with visible signs of reverence? Who hate the Images because they hate the Saints themselves and their Christianity? And, therefore, that it be not thought that we are tied to those terms of distance, which ignorant preachers drive their factions with; it is necessary to declare the grounds of truth, though it displease.”—“Just Weights and Measures,” p. 127.

Bishop Andrewes.

“ For these Relics (were we sure they were true and uncounterfeit) we would carry to them the regard that becometh us. But the Cardinal himself will not say, that St. Hierome ever meant to *adore* the ashes of St. John the Baptist. St. Jerome opposed Vigilantius, that used reproachful terms to the ashes and relics of Martyrs, calling them ‘*vilem pulvisculum*,’ &c., for which he was, and was to be, justly censured.

“ And (even) the carrying them about in linen cloths and kissing them we would rather *bear with, and excuse, as proceeding from popular and private devotion*, than commend.”—“ Answer to XVIIIth Chapter of Cardinal Perron.” No. vii.

Bishop Mountague.

“ Reliquias ipsorum, lipsana, cimelia, deposita, si quæ sint, quæ ad nostram notitiam pervenerint, si quæ nancisci poterimus genuina, non fucata, libenter suscipimus, et *veneratione sua debita, congrua, honoramus*; constet autem hoc, et facile conveniet inter nos de Sanctorum Reliquiis venerandis.”—Orig. Eccl. vol. i. p. 39.

“ Magnam certe gratiam ab Ecclesia Christi et partibus inter se contendentibus is vel illi inirent, qui docerent, quousque progredi *in hoc Sanctorum cultu et lipsanodoulia* possimus, sine justo scandalo, animæ periculo, naufragio pietatis et religionis.”—Ibid. p. 40.

“ Ossa Sanctorum, cineres, reliquias, vase aureo, velamine pretioso, convolvebant. *Ego certe cum Constantino* illas Reliquias fasciis involvam, auro includam, circumgestandas; admovebo labiis, ac collo suspensas, manibus oculisque crebro usurpatas intuebor.”—“ Antidiatriba,” p. 17.

IV.

INTERMEDIATE STATE OF PURIFICATION.

Bishop Forbes.

“AD controversiam hanc tollendam, vel saltem minuendam, Romanenses opinionem suam de Purgatorio *punitivo* quum nullis certis fundamentis, nec in Scripturis, nec in primorum seculorum Patribus, nec in priscis conciliis, nitatur, ut supra demonstratum est, pro fidei articulo nec habeant ipsimet, neque aliis obtrudant. Protestantes etiam, quibus opinio ista improbatur, et quidem jure meritoque, hæreseos tamen, aut impietatis, apertè eandem ne damnent. Sententiæ autem communi Græcorum, atque etiam quorundam virorum doctorum in Latinâ Ecclesiâ de Purgatorio *expiatorio*, (quod solum Purgatorii nomen proprie loquendo meretur,) in quo, sine pœnis gehennalibus, animæ Sanctorum, quorum quasi media quædam conditio est, in cœlis quidem, sed in cœlorum loco, soli Deo noto, magis magisque usque ad diem visionis Dei claræ fruentes conspectu et consortio humanitatis Christi et sanctorum angelorum, perficiunt se in Dei charitate per fervida et morosa suspiria, ut supra dictum est, neutri pertinaciter obluctentur. Suâ enim, atque eâ quidem haud exiguâ probabilitate minime destituitur.”—Consid. Mod. &c. p. 266.

V.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

Bishop Andrewes.

“WE deny not but that the title of Sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all the Five in a larger

signification. But so also to many things more ; the whole matter is a mere *λογομαχία*.”—Answer to Card. Perron.

Thorndike.

“ But for the justifying of ceremonies, why should I allege any thing but those Offices of the Church which the Fathers have called Sacraments, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist? . . . That which I am to say of them here, consists of two points. That they are offices necessary to be ministered to all Christians concerned in them ; and that they are to be solemnized with those ceremonies, for which they are, without any cause of offence, called Sacraments by the Fathers of the Church.”—Just Weights and Measures, p. 118.

Then he proceeds :

“ 1. (CONFIRMATION.) The gift of the Holy Ghost which Baptism promiseth, dependeth upon the Bishop’s blessing.

“ 2. (ORDERS.) If the profession of Christianity infer the grace of Baptism, shall not the profession of that Christianity which the state of the Clergy in general, or that particular degree to which every man is ordained, importeth, infer the grace which the discharge of it requireth?

“ 3. (PENANCE.) If a Christian, after Baptism, fall into any grievous sin, voiding the effect of Baptism, can it fall within the sense of a Christian to imagine, that he can be restored by a *Lord have mercy upon me*? No ; it must cost him hot tears, &c., with fasting and alms, *to take revenge upon himself, to appease God’s wrath*, and to mortify his concupiscence if his sin be notorious he must then satisfy the Church, that he doth what is requisite to *satisfy God* ; that is, to appease His wrath, and to recover

His grace, &c. If it be the Power of the Keys that makes the Church, *it will be hard to show the face of a Church*, where the blessing of the Church, and the Communion of the Eucharist is granted, and yet no Power of the Keys at all exercised. Nay, it will appear a lamentable case, to consider, how simple innocent Christians are led on till death in an opinion, that they want nothing requisite for the pardon and absolution of their sins, when it is manifest that they want the Keys of the Church, as it is manifest, that the Keys are not used for that purpose.

“4. (EXTREME UNCTION.) St. James ordaineth that the Presbyters of every Church pray for the sick with a promise of pardon for their sins He requireth them also to *anoint the sick with oil*, promising recovery upon it. Neither is there any cause why the same benefit should not be expected, but the decay of Christianity in the Church. So the unction of the sick is to recover health, not prepare for death, (as the Church of Rome now useth it,) but supposing the health of the soul restored by the Keys of the Church.

5. “(MARRIAGE.) As for Marriage, the solemnity of the blessing, the ring, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which, *according to the custom of the whole Church*, it ought to be ministered with, will easily make it a Sacrament.”

Bishop Mountague.

“Bellarmine saith that Calvin admitteth Ordination for a Sacrament. And Bellarmine doth not belie Calvin, for he doth so indeed. Impositionem manuum Sacramentum esse concedo. (l. iv. c. xix. s. 31.) How that is he expresseth himself, (ib. c. iv. s. 20.) non invitus patior vocari Sacramentum inter *ordinaria* Sacramenta, non numero. No Papist living, I think, will say, or desire, more. It is not for *all*, but for

some. Which saying of his is semblably expressed in that short, small, but perfect, Catechism in our Communion Book, where is said Two *only*, as *generally necessary*, &c. not excluding others from that *name* and *designation*, though from the *prerogative* and *degree*.”—Appello Cæs. c. xxxiii.—(Points of Popery.)

GENERAL COUNCILS.

Bishop Mountague.

“THE Church of England may seem to have been of a contrary mind in her determinations; and to have taught, and prescribed to be so taught, that such General Councils, true and lawful, not only may err for possibility, but also have erred in reality. For Article xxi. we read thus: “General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, for as much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things appertaining unto God.” Which decision of the Article is not home to this purpose. First, The Article avoucheth, that General Councils have erred: which cannot be understood of my limitation, fundamentals; because there is no such Extat of any General Council, true and lawful. Secondly, things appertaining unto God are not all fundamentals; but points of piety, God’s service, and religion, which admit a very large interpretation. For many things appertain unto God, that are not of necessity unto salvation, both in practice and speculation. In these haply General Councils have erred; in those other, none can err. The Council of Nice determined the controversy of Easter: it was not fundamental. I put the case, that in it they erred. It was a thing appertaining unto God, in His service: this may come under the sense and censure

of the Article ; but this toucheth not my opinion concerning only Fundamentals. Thirdly, The Article speaketh at large concerning General Councils, both for debating and deciding. I only spake of the determination : wherein it may be possibly they nor can, nor shall err, that may and have erred in the discussing. In that very Council of Nice, it was an error in debating, though not fundamental, touching that yoke of single life, which they had meant once to have imposed upon the Church : but in conclusion they erred not. Paphnutius gave better advice, and they followed it. The Article may very well have aimed at this difference in Prosecution and Decision, in saying, All are not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, which is most true ; but some are : and those some, in all probability, ever may prevail, as ever hitherto in such Councils in those cases they have prevailed, against the greater part formerly resolved otherwise. Again, The Article speaketh of General Councils indefinitely, without precisely determining which are General, which not ; what is a General Council, what not : and so may, and doth include reputed or pretended General Councils, *univocè* General, though not exactly and truly indeed (such as was the Council of Ariminum) whereof I did not so much as intend to speak ; my speech being limited with true and lawful : of which sort are not many to be found. Lastly, The Article speaketh of things that are *controversæ fidei* and *contentiosi juris*. I speak of things plainly delivered in Holy Scripture : for such are the fundamental points of our faith. And that it is so, the ensuing words of the Article do insinuate ; things necessary unto salvation, must be taken out of Scripture alone. Councils have no such over-awing power and authority, as to tie men to believe, upon pain of damnation, without express warrant of God's Word, as is rightly resolved in the Article. They are but interpreters of the law ;

they are not absolute to make such a law. Interpretation is required but in things of doubtful issue: our fundamentals are no such. Councils are supposed not to exceed their commission, which warranteth them to debate and determine questions and things *litigiosi status*. If they do not *hoc agere* sincerely, if they shall presume to make laws without warrant, and new articles of faith, (who have no farther authority than to interpret them,) laws without God's Word, that shall bind the conscience, and require obedience upon life and death; our Church will not justify their proceedings, nor do I."—Appello Cæs. (Points of Popery.)

THE CASE OF BISHOP MOUNTAGUE IN THE REIGN OF
KING JAMES I.

THE following account of the proceedings against Bishop Mountague is taken from the "Biographia Britannica," vol. v. p. 3188.

"In 1622, some Romanists having attempted to proselyte one of his parishioners at Stamford-Rivers, to that Faith ; not being able to procure a conference, he sent them three propositions in writing by way of challenge, in defence of the doctrine of the Church of England. In return to these, about eighteen months after, receiving a piece with this title, '*A Gagg for the Gospel*,' he wrote an answer to it, which being published in 1624, some tenets therein advanced raised such a flame against him among the Calvinistical Puritans, that two of the most zealous preachers in that way, at Ipswich, drew up several Articles, charging him with Popery and Arminianism, in order to present them to the Parliament. But our author having procured a copy of that paper, with an information of their design, immediately applied to the King for protection ; who gave him leave to defend himself, and also to print his defence, if Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, should approve his doctrine, as agreeable to that of the Church of England. Under these cautions, his famous treatise, entitled, '*Appello Cæsarem*,' or a '*Just Appeal from two unjust Informers*,' was published in 1625, soon after the accession of king Charles the First to the throne. But the Calvinistical

principles being still warmly espoused, his book was taken under examination by the House of Commons, and several proceedings there were held against him in the two first parliaments of that reign. The divines also published a great number of answers thereto. However, he found means to defeat the attempts of all his opponents ; and, upon the death of one of them, Dr. George Carleton, Bishop of Chichester, in 1628, he was nominated by his Majesty to that see. In which he was confirmed (though not without an extraordinary opposition,) on Friday, August 22nd, that year, and consecrated the Sunday following at Croydon. He was allowed to hold the rectory of Petworth, of which he had been possessed some years *in commendam* ; and having obtained a special pardon from his Majesty, he applied himself closely to his favourite study of Church antiquities, and first published his '*Originum Ecclesiasticarum Apparatus*,' at Oxford, 1635 ; which was followed in 1636 by his '*Originum Ecclesiasticarum tomus primus*.' In 1638, upon the promotion of Dr. Matthew Wren to Ely, our author was translated to Norwich."

In the notes to the above passage is contained a particular account of the several tenets objected to Bishop Mountague, with the grounds of the objection. It is as follows :

" Those [objectionable statements] touching popery were,
 1. That the Church representative cannot err, p. 45. 2. That the Fathers did not any way fail, nor did darkness possess their clear understandings, chap. viii. p. 113. 3. He calleth the doctrine of the invisibility of the Church a private opinion, no doctrinal decision of the Protestants. 4. That the Bishop of Rome personally is not Antichrist, nor yet the Bishops of Rome successively are that Anti-

christ, *magnus ille Antichristus*. 5. That a sinner is justified when he is made just, that is, translated from a state of nature to a state of grace, which act is motion, as they speak, between two terms, consisting in forgiveness of sins primarily, and grace infused secondarily, in which doctrine of Justification he accordeth fully with the Council of Trent, (Sess. vi. chap. 37.) and contradicteth the doctrine of the Church of England in the book of Homilies, (Sermon of Salvation,) and all other reformed Churches. 6. He so extends *meritum ex condigno*, that he would make men believe there is no material difference betwixt us and the Papists, in this point. 7. That touching evangelical counsels, he saith, ‘I know no doctrine of our English Church against them.’ 8. That howsoever in words he denieth *limbus patrum*; yet thus he writeth, ‘The Patriarchs, Prophets, and Fathers, that lived and died before Christ, the Scripture resolveth they were not there, where now they are, in the highest heavens, there where the glorified body of Christ is now residing, at the right hand of God.’ chap. xli. p. 27. 9. Touching Images he writeth thus: ‘Images have three uses assigned by your schools; stay there, go no farther, and we charge you not with idolatry. *Institutionem rudium, commonefactionem historice, et exercitationem devotionis*, you and we also give unto them. (chap. xliii. p. 300, 301.) Images in Gregory’s times were very much improved, to be books for the simple and ignorant people; hold you there, and we blame you not:’ and a little after, ‘Images are not utterly unlawful unto Christians in all manner of religious employment. The pictures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and Saints, may be made, and had in houses, and set up in churches. The Protestants have them, they despight them not; respect and honour may be given unto them. Protestants do it, and use them for helps of piety,’ (which directly contradicteth the doctrine of the Church of England in the book of Homilies.)

10. Of signing our children only in Baptism with the sign of the cross, he speaketh very superstitiously. 'We use signing with the sign of the cross, both on the forehead, and elsewhere. Caro signatur ut anima muniatur, said Tertulian, and so we. Chap. 46, he citeth and approveth the testimony of one of them,' (Athanas. de Incarn. Verbi, p. 61.) 'By the sign of the cross of Christ all magic spells are disappointed, witchcraft and sorcery cometh to nothing; all idols are confounded and forsaken.' 'He profeseth that he knoweth no cause of such distraction and disaffection betwixt us and the Papists, for the reverent use of signing with the sign of the cross.' Chap. viii. p. 60. He saith, 'Joshua prevailed against Amalek through the sign of the cross, rather than by the sword.' 11. Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he writeth very popishly; for first he calleth the Supper of the Lord, in express terms, *the Sacrament of the Altar*, and afterwards, more fully: 'But that you were bred up,' says he, 'in a faction, otherwise you would acknowledge there need be no difference betwixt the Papists and us in the point of Real Presence,' p. 253. And again, 'No man denieth a change, an alteration, a *transmutation*, a *transelementation*, as they speak.' 12. Touching confession, 'We require,' says he, 'men to make special Confession, if they find their consciences troubled with any matter, either when they be sick, or before receiving of the Lord's Supper;' his words are, 'in the case of perplexity, for the quieting of men disturbed in their consciences.' 13. He taketh no exception to his adversary for calling it [Ordination] *the Sacrament of Holy Orders*. But denieth our Church to hold any such opinion, as that no inferior grace is given by imposition of hands in the Sacrament of Holy Orders, chap. xxviii. p. 269. 14. Touching the power of the Priest to forgive sins, 'this is the doctrine,' saith he, 'of our Communion book, and the practice of our Church

accordingly, that the Priests have power not only to pronounce, but to give, remission of sins, chap. xi. p. 78, 79. And it is confessed, that all Priests, and none but Priests have power to forgive sin.' ”

Then follow the several heads of allegation.

“After a preamble containing the charge in general from his three books, ‘*An Answer to the late Gagg of the Protestants,*’ ‘*A Treatise of the Invocation of Saints,*’ and ‘*Appello Cæsarem,*’ as contrary to the Articles of 1562, it begins thus: ‘Article 1. Whereas in the thirty-fifth of the Articles abovementioned, it is declared that the second book of the Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, in the tenth homily of which book it is determined, that the Church of Rome, as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and upwards, is so far gone from the nature of a true Church, that nothing can be more; he, the said R. Mountague, in several places of his said book, called ‘*An Answer to the Gagger,*’ chap. v. p. 49. and in his other book, called ‘*Appello,*’ &c. doth advisedly maintain and affirm, that the Church of Rome is, and ever was, a true Church since it was a Church. Article 2. Whereas in the said homily, it is likewise declared, that the Church of Rome is not built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles; and in the twenty-eighth of said Articles, that Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament; and in the twenty-fifth of the said Articles, that Five other reputed Sacraments of the Church of Rome are not to be accounted Sacraments: yet *contrary*, and *repugnant hereunto*, he, the said Richard Mountague, doth maintain and affirm in his book aforesaid, called the ‘*Answer to the Gagg,*’ p. 50, that the Church of Rome hath ever remained firm upon the same Foundation of Sacraments and Doctrine instituted by God. Article 3.

Thirdly, in the nineteenth of the same Articles, it is further determined, that the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their use and manner of ceremonies, but also in matter of faith. He, the said Richard Mountague, speaking of those points which belong to faith and manners, hope and charity, doth in the same book, called the ‘Gagger,’ p. 14, affirm and maintain, that none of those are controverted *inter partes*, meaning the Protestants and the Papists; and that notwithstanding, in the thirty-fourth Article it is resolved, that the sacrifices of masses, in which, as is commonly said, the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt too, are blasphemous follies and dangerous deceits: this being one of the points controverted between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; the said Richard Mountague, in his book called the ‘Gagger,’ p. 14, doth affirm and maintain, that the controverted points are of a less and inferior allay: of them a man may be ignorant, without any danger of his salvation; a man may resolve, or oppose this, or that, or any, without peril of perishing for ever. Article 4. Whereas, in the third homily, intituled, ‘Against peril of Idolatry,’ it is declared that Images read no good lesson neither of God nor godliness, but all error and wickedness; he, the said Richard, in the book aforesaid, called the ‘Answer to the late Gagger,’ p. 38, doth affirm and maintain, that Images may be used for the instruction of the ignorant, and excitation of devotion. Article 5. That in the same it is plainly expressed, that the attributing the defence of some countries to Saints, is a spoiling God of his honour, and that such Saints are but *as Diï Tutelares* of the Gentile idolaters, the said Richard Mountague, hath, notwithstanding, in the book aforementioned, affirmed and maintained, that Saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends, and that it may be admitted, that some Saints

have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as Angels also have over certain persons and countries, by especial deputation, and that it is no impiety so to believe.

.....

“Item. ‘The scope and end of the said Richard Mountague in the books aforementioned, is to give encouragement to Popery, and to withdraw his Majesty’s subjects from the true religion established to the Roman superstition; and, consequently, to be reconciled to the see of Rome. All which he laboureth by subtle and cunning ways; whereby God’s true religion hath been much scandalized; and those mischiefs introduced, which the wisdom of many laws hath endeavoured to prevent, to the great peril and hazard of our sovereign lord the king, and of all his dominions and loving subjects. Lastly, that the aforesaid Richard Mountague hath, in the aforesaid book, called the ‘Appeal,’ divers passage dishonourable to the late king and his Majesty’s father, of famous memory; full of bitterness, railing, and injurious to several other persons; disgraceful and contemptuous to many worthy divines, both of this Church of England, and other reformed Churches beyond the seas; impious and profane in scoffing at preaching, meditating, conferring, pulpits, lectures, bibles, and all show of religion: all which do aggravate his former offences, as having proceeded from malicious and envenomed hate against the peace of this Church, and sincerity of the reformed religion publicly professed, and by law established in this kingdom.

“ ‘All which offences being to the high dishonour of Almighty God, and of most mischievous effect and consequence against the good of His Church and common weal of England, and of all his Majesty’s realms and dominions; The Commons assembled in parliament do hereby pray, that the said Richard Mountague may be punished according to his demerits, in that exemplary manner as may deter

others from attempting so presumptuously to disturb the peace of Church and State, and that the books aforesaid may be suppressed and burnt.' ”

In reference to the foregoing history, it is important to observe: 1. That the persons who brought these charges against Bishop Mountague were *Puritans*; and that the whole proceeding was one of the earlier stages of a movement which issued in the Great Rebellion. 2. That, accordingly, it was *Arminianism*, as well as, and rather than, “Popery,” which was objected. 3. That the proceedings were instituted not by the Church, but by *the House of Commons*. 4. That the allegations were founded in part upon a book (the *Appello Cæsarem*,) written by Bishop Mountague *in his own vindication*, and consequently with peculiar caution, and with the *utmost degree of qualification* which he could conscientiously make. In this treatise, so far from retracting, or explaining away, previous statements, he is found, (like the writer of Tract 90., in his explanations to Dr. Jelf and the Bishop of Oxford,) to *repeat*, and *maintain*, them. 5. That *contrariety to the Articles and Homilies* is the ground of charge.

It remains only to narrate the result. The king, at the instance of the House of Commons, laid the whole matter before a Committee of the Bishops, consisting of the following :

George Montaigne, Bishop of London.

Richard Neyle, Bishop of Durham.

Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester.

John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester, (President of St. John's College, Oxford.)

William Laud, Bishop of St. David's, (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.)¹

The letter containing the judgment of this body of representative Prelates, is preserved in the British Museum, (Harl. MS. 7000. Art. 104.) The following is an exact copy :—

“To the Right Honourable, our very good Lord, the Duke of Buckingham, his Grace.

“ May it please your Grace,

“ Upon your late Letters, directed to the Bishop of Winchester, signifying his Majesties pleasure, that taking to Him the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, or some of them, He and They should take into consideration the busines concerning Mr. Mountagu's late Booke, and deliver their opinions touching the same, for the preservation of the truth and the peace of the Church of England, together with the safetie of Mr. Mountagu's person ; We have met and considered, and for our particulars doe think that Mr. Mountagu, in his Booke, hath not affirmed any thing to be the doctrine of the Church of England, but that which in our opinions is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereunto. And for the preservation of the peace of the Church, wee

¹ It is remarkable that the decision in the case of Bishop Mountague was pronounced by a body, constituted precisely in the same way with that which *originally* sanctioned the Thirty-nine Articles ; viz. a Committee of Bishops, nominated by the king.

in humilitie doe conceive, That his Majestie shall doe most graciously to prohibite all parties members of the Church of England any further controverting of those questions by publick preaching, or writing, or any other way, to the disturbance of the peace of this Church, for the time to come. And for any thing that may further concerne Mr. Mountagu's person in that busines, we humbly commend him to his Majesties gracious favour and pardon. And so we humbly recommend your Grace to the protection of the Almighty, resting

“ Your Grace's faithfull and humble Servants,

(Signed) “ GEO. LONDON.
R. DUNELM.
LA. WINTON.
JO. ROFFENS.
GUIL. MENEVE.”

“ From Winchester House,
January 16, 1625.”

A D D E N D A.

Page 14. Note.

The words in this extract, which declare that Roman Catholics were not pressed at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth to "join" her "sect" or "deny their Faith," undoubtedly intimate *the writer's opinion*, that the former of these acts would have been tantamount to the latter, and so far make against the present view. However, *the fact* was not as he states, for, as is shown farther on, the Roman Catholics *were* pressed to subscribe the Articles, and did subscribe them.

Page 20.

It has been customary with writers who have been offended by the Catholic tone of the Prayer-book (e. g. the Athanasian Creed, or parts of the Baptismal service) to contend that the Reformers yielded, in such matters, to the "prejudices of their time." This view has been put forth, especially, by the late Mr. Scott, of Aston Sandford. Again, a Clergyman of the Established Church, in our own days, whose zeal all must respect, has proposed to *bracket* certain expressions in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, &c., as at least "*equivocal*," "*unwise*," &c. (See Brit. Mag., No. cxvi. July 1841.) All this is to the present point.

Page 27.

It may be observed that Mr. Newman, in his view of the subject of the Papal Supremacy, does not deny, that union with the rest of Christendom under one visible government is the most perfect state of the Church, but only that it is *essential to the very being*

of a Church. The distinction is clearly pointed out in a very interesting and striking letter, which has lately appeared in *l' Univers*, with the signature, "Un jeune membre de L' Université d'Oxford." The genuineness of this letter has, I believe, been questioned, but, I may add, without the slightest foundation.

"La Papauté . . . est plutôt la forme accidentelle, que la forme essentielle, de l'Eglise ; c' est à dire, elle ressemble plutôt à la *chaleur*, qu' à la *vie*, de l'Eglise."

Page 28.

In saying that there is no instance of any political enactment, bearing upon Catholic doctrine, "between the Reformation and Revolution," I have named too wide an interval. The first attempt made, on the part of the State, to interfere with *doctrine*, was, I believe, in 1673, when the Test Act, and Declarations against Transubstantiation and Invocation of Saints, on the ground of idolatry, were introduced as a qualification for offices of trust. These securities, as Mr. Hallam observes in his "Constitutional History of England," were added in consequence of the Oath of Supremacy being found ineffectual ; not, then, from *religious*, but from purely *political* motives ; the State thus venturing to tamper with the holiest of subjects for its own subordinate ends. The new restrictions were forced upon the court by what is called the "country party," termed, as Mr. Hallam tells us, (vol. ii. p. 525.) by the court, *factionous*, *fanatical*, and *republican*. In 1679 the same declaration was imposed upon members of both Houses of Parliament, at the time of taking their seats. Between these two periods, Mr. Hallam says, "the clergy in their sermons, even the most respectable of their order, Sancroft, Sharpe, Barlow, Burnet, Stillingfleet, called for the severest laws against Catholics" (in consequence of Titus Oates's plot). On the other hand, however, the essay noticed in this pamphlet ("Considerations on the True Way of suppressing Popery, &c.") was published during this interval, with the view of opposing the attempt to put any restriction at all upon *loyal*

Roman Catholics. This essay is commonly attributed to Bishop Barlow, although the name of that prelate is in Mr. Hallam's list. But, whatever may have been the sentiments of the clergy, certain it is that the measures of 1679 emanated from no quarter in which they exercised influence, but, as Mr. Hallam tells us, (p. 580.) from the "popular party¹." Nothing more was done till the year 1700, when an attempt was made to enforce the above-mentioned Declaration upon the children of Roman Catholics, at the age of 18, as a condition of the tenure of landed property.

Page 29. Note.

"The fate of this rubric is worthy of notice. It was excluded by Queen Elizabeth in 1559; and its removal clearly shows, that the *Church could not then be brought to express an opinion adverse to the Real Presence*. It was restored in 1661, on the revision of King Charles II.; and its *reappearance may likewise be employed to show*, that the Church, at that time also, was unwilling to make any declaration on that important tenet. *To prevent misapprehension on this point*, the words 'real and essential' . . . were altered into *the very different expression*, 'corporal.'—Dr. Cardwell, "History of Conferences," p. 35, note.

¹ It is curious that Mr. Hallam, in a note on this subject, draws the same distinction, for which Mr. Newman has been so much blamed, between the Roman doctrine and practice, and seems to justify assent to the Declaration then imposed on the part of an individual, prepared to condemn the *latter* alone. "Invocation of Saints," he says, "as held and explained by that Church in the Council of Trent, is surely not idolatrous, with whatever error it may be charged; but the practice at least of uneducated Roman Catholics seems *fully to justify the Declaration*; understanding it to refer to certain superstitions, countenanced, or not eradicated, by their Clergy."

THE END.

DOCUMENTARY ILLUSTRATIONS

OF

THE PRINCIPLES TO BE KEPT IN VIEW

IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

